DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 281 UD 009 972

AUTHOR	Gould, Karolyn R.
TITLE	Where Do We Go From Here? A Study of the Roads and Roadblocks to Career Mobility for Paraprofessionals Working in Human Service Agencies.
INSTITUTION	National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	158p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.00
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Opportunities, Career Planning, Community Agencies (Public), Disadvantaged Youth, *Employment Practices, Human Services, Job Training, Minority Groups, *Nonprofessional Personnel, *Occupational Mobility
IDENTIFIERS	*National Committee On The Employment of Youth

ABSTRACT

This report gives the findings of a study designed to identify obstacles to career mobility among paraprofessionals in social service agencies and to make recommendations for opening channels for advancement. The experiences of a group of paraprofessionals hired in a special project in 1965 and 1966 by the National Committee on Employment of Youth (NCEY) provided data for the study. Obstacles were civil service requirements, professional standards, lack of supplementary training and education, and the insistence of a B.A. degree for eligibility to higher level jobs. Implementation of a national policy of guarantee of equal opportunity for advancement, (1) through measures designed to help paraprofessionals advance within the current framework of agency hiring policies and job structures, (2) through measures designed to help agencies change that framework, and (3) through measures designed to help fields of service re-evaluate the total framework of their services and use of manpower, is recommended. Specific ways of implementing the above recommendations are summarized. Appended are background information on the NCEY questionnaire, and a list of agencies employing and/or training NCEY graduates. (KG)

ED039281

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH
145 EAST 32nd STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y., 10016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

A STUDY OF THE ROADS AND ROADBLOCKS TO CAREER MOBILITY FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS WORKING IN HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES

Conducted under a grant from the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. The opinions expressed are those of the National Committee on Employment of Youth.

UD009972

December 1969

Karolyn R. Gould, Project Director
James Smith, Research Associate
Terri Masi, Administrative Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

INTRODUCTION ii-1

PART ONE: THE STUDY

CHAPTER ONE METHODOLOGY 1-1

CHAPTER TWO AGENCIES AND TRAINEES: AN OVERVIEW 2-1

CHAPTER THREE THE CASE STUDIES 3-1

PART TWO: THE FINDINGS

CHAPTER FOUR HOW FAR WERE THEY ABLE TO GO? 4-1

CHAPTER FIVE ON THE JOB: THE TASKS PERFORMED 5-1

CHAPTER SIX TRAINING, EDUCATION AND CAREER MOBILITY 6-1

CHAPTER SEVEN SUPERVISION AND CAREER MOBILITY 7-1

CHAPTER EIGHT THE IMPACT OF CIVIL SERVICE, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND UNIONS 8-1

CHAPTER NINE PARAPROFESSIONALS, AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITY 9-1

PART THREE: WHERE DO THEY GO FROM HERE?

CHAPTER TEN SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS 10-1

CHAPTER ELEVEN RECOMMENDATIONS 11-1

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A BACKGROUND ON THE NCEY TRAINING PROGRAM A-1

APPENDIX B TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE B

APPENDIX C LIST OF AGENCIES EMPLOYING AND/OR TRAINING NCEY GRADUATES C-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE A	Comparative Profile of Paraprofessional Characteristics	2-2
TABLE B	Code for Employers and NCEY Graduates	2-4
TABLE C	Comparison of Starting and Current Salaries	4-3
TABLE D	Post-Training Movement Patterns of Earning Levels	4-3
TABLE E	Tasks Performed in Paraprofessional Jobs	5-3
TABLE F	Breakdown of Tasks Performed	5-4
TABLE G	Paraprofessional Self-Evaluation of Task Performance	5-9
TABLE H	Where Tasks Were Learned	6-2
TABLE I	Types of Training Provided by Eight Agencies	6-5
TABLE J	Education Profile of Study Sample	6-5
TABLE K	Paraprofessional Assessments of Supervision in Eight Agencies	7-8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indebted to many individuals and agencies who helped us to undertake, pursue and complete this report. Among them:

Karolyn R. Gould, the project's director, who carried the major responsibility for conducting the study, analyzing the findings and preparing this report.

James Smith, research associate on the project staff, himself a former NCEY-trained paraprofessional, who conducted the interviews with the graduates and contributed substantially to all other phases of the project as well.

Edith Lynton, author of a number of prior NCEY studies of paraprofessionals, who served as a consultant to the project staff.

Joel Seldin, who participated in planning and implementing several important phases of the study.

Terri Masi, administrative secretary for the project, who was responsible for all details from the first memo through the fiftieth tally of data to the final page of this report.

The staff of the original training program, Seymour Lesh, Deborah Lesser and Mildred Safar, who shared their experience and knowledge with us.

The Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, which provided the sine qua non -- the funds to do the job.

The staffs of the agencies surveyed.

And, finally, the graduates of the NCEY training program, without whose cooperation not a word of the report that follows could have been written.

Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary
National Committee on Employment
of Youth

INTRODUCTION

Few people anticipated the force with which the movement for new careers would sweep through the nation. Four years ago it was only an idea. Today in all parts of the country tens of thousands of individuals, without previous experience and without professional credentials in the human services, are working in schools, welfare bureaus, employment agencies, hospitals, community action and other agencies under programs funded by OEO, HEW and the U.S. Department of Labor. The idea has become an indisputable fact.

The successful placement of so many unemployed or under-employed persons in totally new jobs or in jobs generally reserved for those of different backgrounds is certainly a considerable achievement. Indeed they have been absorbed into these institutions with far less difficulty than originally predicted. The early fears of many professionals and traditional civil service personnel have been dispelled or transformed into a recognition of the substantial contribution paraprofessionals can make.

At the same time any objective assessment of the situation must lead to the parallel conclusion that this large national experiment in the creation of "new careers" is in danger of remaining stalled at the level of deadend jobs. The major failure has been the inability to provide new careerists with opportunities to advance through career ladders beyond the entry level.

The problem of mobility was predictable. Even on a purely theoretical basis, it proved easier to formulate a variety of new entry-level jobs in human services than to link these jobs with more responsible or demanding levels of work in both new agencies and traditional institutions. But some theorists believed the major difficulty would lie in getting new careerists into the established system of human service provision. They reasoned that once the paraprofessionals were in, their presence alone would have sufficient impact to change old structures or to create new career paths. Generally, those who adhered to this viewpoint were concerned more with improving the relationship between service agencies and the community than with the manpower implications of the new careers movement. To those who viewed the paraprofessional as a major manpower instrument, it was clear that career mobility, except in the case of exceptional individuals or special circumstances, would not just happen by itself. They realized that the restructuring of traditional hierarchies and the development of new systems of personnel would be a complex process to conceptualize and still more complex to implement. In the face of structural impediments and resistances, they knew that systematic and coordinated career planning would be required.

It should be recognized, however, that in 1965 there was little concrete experience with paraprofessionals on which to base estimates of their capacities for growth. Today the need for career planning no longer has to be based solely on theory. The concrete experiences of large numbers of paraprofessionals can serve as the material for study.

The rapid upsurge in the employment of paraprofessionals in the human services, moreover, makes it essential at this point to review what has taken place over the past four years. We need to assess the degree of career mobility experienced by the paraprofessionals. We need to identify those factors which made mobility possible and those factors which obstructed it. Such knowledge may then be applied in assessing other programs employing paraprofessionals, in eliminating obstacles to advancement where they exist, and in facilitating greater opportunities for mobility as well.

The question of how to achieve genuine upward mobility for new careerists can be pursued in several ways. One is to examine the paraprofessionals themselves: Are there, for example, factors in their own backgrounds or in their abilities which prevent them from advancing? Or is the failure in the lack of supportive services that employers provide to help them advance?

Another direction of inquiry would be to look at the job design. Are the entry level jobs themselves unsuitable for the building of further steps in the career structure, or has there simply been a failure to plan beyond the entry level? A further route would be to explore whether the trouble lies in the availability or accessibility of additional education or training to qualify those employed for higher level responsibilities. Finally, consideration would have to be given to the obstacles to the fuller development of new careerists caused by the policies of unions, professionals, civil service, funding sources and licensing and credentialling institutions.

THE NCEY PROGRAM

The experiences of a group of paraprofessionals trained in a special project in 1965 and 1966, by the National Committee on Employment of Youth and then employed by a variety of public and private human service agencies, served as a microcosm for an intensive pilot study of career mobility. This training project, one of the first to enroll paraprofessionals, influenced many projects that followed, and provides the longest period of follow-up--nearly four years--of any paraprofessional study to date.

Over a two-year period, 118 paraprofessionals completed training. More than half were placed immediately in jobs related to their training in 34 agencies. They held 20 different job titles, ranging from Assistant Teacher to Job Developer, and Vocational Evaluator to Youth Advisor.

The NCEY 12-week training program for paraprofessionals was repeated for six cycles of some 20 enrollees each. The training components--classroom and on-the-job--had a twofold effect. First, to the employing agencies, it often represented the first opportunity to hire paraprofessionals trained for the job, and therefore stimulated some reassessment of agency job requirements. As a result in some cases, former professional functions were reassigned to paraprofessionals. Second, the trainees were furnished with new skills and launched into new work settings different from the generally unskilled jobs they had formerly held.

As the program ended, there was reason for optimism on the part of the trainees, the agencies and NCEY. The trainees had demonstrated greater capacity than had been expected. The agencies reported that the paraprofessionals had positive contributions to make, and NCEY found its role of broker or matchmaker between trainees and agencies beneficial to both.

It should be noted that there was also satisfaction initially with the resulting new employment opportunities for paraprofessionals This was a significant accomplishment at the time. The issue of career mobility for paraprofessionals arose subsequently, once the use of paraprofessionals had been institutionalized and their value was no longer questioned by the employing agencies. Then it became apparent that it was not sufficient to replace one dead-end job with another and that the future of paraprofessionals had to include a promise of some degree of career mobility as well as increasing diversity of career opportunities.

HOW TO INCREASE CAREER MOBILITY

Since the NCEY training program ended, many approaches have been suggested and developed to deal with the problem of increasing career mobility for paraprofessionals. The following alternatives are being proposed or tried:

1) A total restructuring of jobs in human services so that new possibilities for mobility will be created.

2) Special training to open up opportunities for advancement and to increase options for different kinds of employment.

3) Newly designed higher education programs--more related to job needs than traditional education--for new categories of staff drawn from minority groups residing in low-income areas.

4) The establishment of a new academic credential, an associate degree for paraprofessional staff.

5) The blurring or ending of traditional differentiations between professional and paraprofessional functions in the human services, on the theory that traditional professional education does not prepare individuals for work in poverty areas with minority group populations.

Because opinions are proliferating so quickly, there is need for experience-based knowledge upon which to draw judgments of the correct alternatives. The NCEY demonstration program provides the opportunity for a retrospective view of three to four years' experience, a sufficient time period for individuals to have advanced on the job

Because enough time had elapsed since the NCEY Training Program was completed to yield meaningful information, the U.S. Department of Labor in November, 1968 made a grant to the National Committee on Employment of Youth to conduct a 6-month study for the following purposes:

1. To identify and locate the graduates of NCEY's training program, to examine their experiences with respect to advancement on the job, and to evaluate their impact on the job structure and service delivery in the agencies where they were employed.

2. To assess the experiences of the employing agencies in providing upward mobility to graduates of the NCEY training program.

3. To the extent that the findings in one and two above would permit, to develop guides for building in greater upward mobility in new careers programs.

4. To the extent that three above was feasible, to develop a demonstration program to test one or more models for achieving maximal upward mobility for subprofessionals.

PART ONE

THE STUDY

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

For its approach to the study, NCEY decided to conduct a case study of a small sample of the agencies that were employing the NCEY graduates. It was reasoned that graduates would have had experiences with a wide number of agencies. If the main objectives had been to measure the degree of mobility that each of them achieved, a trainee-oriented approach would have been called for. But that was not the case. The main objective was rather to measure the impact of paraprofessionals on the agencies and to search out and identify those factors that had contributed to or impeded opportunities for mobility.

Through an in-depth study of a small sample, it was hypothesized that multi-variant factors could be examined thoroughly to reveal those having had an impact, for good or bad, on mobility. In addition the most relevant questions could be identified and made available for subsequent follow-up studies on the career mobility of paraprofessionals.

The selection of agencies was to be based on establishing a (1) cross-section of fields of service, i.e., health , employment, education, community action; (2) cross-section of auspices, i.e., public and private; (3) cross-section of size, i.e., small, medium and large . An additional consideration was making sure the agency employed enough NCEY graduates; at least two per agency and hopefully more, were desired.

LOCATING THE GRADUATES

The first job was to learn where the NCEY graduates were located. A variety of techniques to find them were used: letters phone calls, leads from graduates who had been found about those who had not, and last, a meeting in the form of a reunion for all NCEY graduates. The objectives of the reunion were to (1) get more leads on the present whereabouts of missing graduates, and (2) to get direct feedback from the NCEY graduates on their experiences since they completed the training program and to secure a group sense--if not consensus--on the range of experiences and opportunities and obstacles encountered in the course of pursuing new careers in the human services.

When the efforts to locate graduates were suspended, 83 had been reached, 3 were found to be deceased or ill and 33 of the original 118 graduates had still not been located. However, since more than a representative sample had already been identified, it was unnecessary to pursue the search further for those who had not been found.

A classification system was used to record the data secured about the employment histories of the NCEY graduates. Individual employment histories were constructed for each graduate. A separate record was established for each agency that had employed a graduate, so that employer histories with NCEY graduates could be readily perceived. The objective of this classification system was to provide the data base for the selection of agencies for case study. Using the criteria for cross-representation already noted, eight agencies were selected. Among them, they employed 26 NCEY graduates.

DEVELOPING THE CASE STUDY DESIGN

On the basis of NCEY's knowledge of paraprofessional programs, the design for the case studies was developed. The objective was to provide through the studies not only an overview of each agency, but also an overview of all the agencies by topical clusters. The topics selected for the study included: (1) agency structure, (2) agency policy, (3) agency training, (4) agency-provided education, (5) agency supervision, (6) agency civil service, union or professional credentialing requirements, and, (7) the former trainees.

The methodology called for securing the data for each topical cluster from a variety of sources. As most of the responses would be subjective judgments, it was necessary to cross-check views and perceptions on each topic to reduce the possibility of distortion and increase the probability of accuracy. It was considered desirable to identify the frequency of similarity of perceptions and the frequency of differences between paraprofessionals and staff members on the same question. For each agency under study, therefore, the plan called for a series of interviews,when applicable, with:

1. The agency executive for an articulation from the point of view of the agency itself.

2. The graduates' supervisors within the agency.
3. The training director at the agency.
4. Any outside education agency used by the employer in behalf of the former trainees.
5. A principal source of information about the civil service, union and credentialing policies of the particular agency.
6. The NCEY graduates within the agency.

THE INTERVIEWS

Interviews were held with each of the 26 NCEY graduates working in the agencies and with 37 agency and agency-related personnel, including executives, personnel staff, unit directors, college staff and other sources of information about activities in particular areas, such as career planning and job restructuring, that could have impact on the agencies being studied. Through field study, data was obtained for the measurement of mobility achieved by the graduates.

The instrument used for the interviews with NCEY graduates was designed with the topical format already noted.* However, within each topical area, there were a series of open-ended questions. The total instrument was somewhat structured so that both interagency and intra-agency analyses could be made of the responses.

The interviews with the trainees were conducted by a research associate of the project team who had himself been a trainee of the original NCEY program. The objective was to establish peer-level interaction and thereby create as unthreatening a climate for

* See appendix for sample questionnaire

the interview as possible. The expectation was that communication would be less likely to be qualified or censored to meet the preconceived expectations of the interviewer than is generally the case. This proved to be a successful approach and produced highly informative data. Put roughly, the questioning of graduates pertained to factual information on employment tenure, mobility, wages, etc; a listing of the tasks performed on the job rated according to the amount of time spent on each; an evaluation of the supervision offered; an evaluation of the training offered within and outside the agency; the opportunities and obstacles to career advancement; the availability of educational opportunities; and reactions to the employment in general.

The interviews of the agency personnel were not structured. However, they followed the same topical format. Field testing of a more structured questionnaire had revealed deficiencies rather quickly, since agencies varied significantly in structure, policy and relationship with the former trainees. Using an individualized approach within the topical format, it was possible to obtain multiple judgments , perceptions and experiences with greater clarity.

CHAPTER II

THE TRAINEES and THE AGENCIES: AN OVERVIEW

The characteristics of the sample of 26 graduates employed by the eight agencies under study were compared with those of the total of 83 NCEY graduates about whom information had been obtained. In addition, the availability of findings from a national study conducted by the New Careers Institute of the University Research Corporation in Washington, D.C. enabled us to compare the characteristics of the NCEY training group with those of a much larger nationwide sample.

Table A on the following page shows what we found. In brief, the comparison revealed a number of differences. The NCEY group contained a much greater proportion of men than in the national sample, as well as a greater proportion of Spanish-speaking and a smaller proportion of white enrollees. In addition, the NCEY group included more individuals who had attended college.

But the similarities far outweighed the differences. Individuals in both the NCEY group and in the national sample were on the average relatively young with the women several years older than the men. More than two-thirds were Negro, close to half were high school graduates, a little over a third were married and the great majority had been unemployed before beginning their training.

THE AGENCIES

The eight agencies selected for case study are representative as a group of the kinds of agencies employing paraprofessionals in the delivery of services to residents of low-income communities in New York City. They include :

TABLE A

COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF PARAPROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	New Careers Institute Nationwide Sample	70% (83) NCEY Training Graduates	26 NCEY Graduates, Study Sample
Sex:			
Male	20%	44%	42%
Female	80%	56%	58%
Average Age:			
Male	28	26	26
Female	31	33	34
Education:			
Less than H.S.	48%	28%	35%
H.S. Graduate	46%	48%	46%
Some College	6%	24%	19%
Marital Status:			
Married	38%	n.a.	35%
Single, divorced, separated, widowed	62%	n.a.	65%
Ethnic Breakdown:			
Negro	74%	76%	70%
White	20%	1%	0%
Spanish-speaking (Puerto Rican, Cuban, Panamanian, etc.)	6%	23%	30%
Employment Record:			
Pre-Training			
Unemployed	89%	69%	81%
Employed	11%	31%	19%
Post-Training EMPLOYERS			
Health	43%	14%	27%
Education	32%	4%	8%
Law Enforcement	12%	0%	0%
Multi-Service Community	n.a.	49%	22%
Public Service	n.a.	16%	27%
Other	13%	0%	0%
Out of Labor Market	n.a.	7%	8%
Unemployed	n.a.	10%	8%

N.A.= not available

Two voluntary non-profit agencies operating multi-service programs in geographically circumscribed areas.

Two public agencies providing employment services and operating within the civil service system.

One voluntary agency providing community mental health services within a hospital and university medical college complex.

One public agency specializing in addiction control and treatment and operating under civil service.

One voluntary agency offering comprehensive services to pre-school children and their families, operated by two non-profit sponsors.

One voluntary hospital, formerly a municipal hospital, operating in a major ghetto, under the auspices of a large university.

Five of the eight agencies were established within the last decade. Their operations depend upon the continued availability of federal funds. The other three agencies are long established, but utilize paraprofessionals in new programs or new services that are also federally funded.

The eight agencies probably represent a much wider number of agencies in terms of the range of opportunities for advancement that they offer paraprofessionals. The spectrum runs from agencies where paraprofessionals are considered eligible for entry-level jobs only to one agency that provides unlimited opportunities for paraprofessionals to advance to administrative and managerial positions.

Each of the eight agencies was assigned a code letter, from A through H. Each trainee was designated by the employing agency's code and a number in the sequence of the total NCEY trainees employed there. The following table delineates the code symbols in use throughout the study:

TABLE B

CODE USED TO IDENTIFY EMPLOYER AGENCIES AND NCEY GRADUATES

Agency Symbols	No. NCEY Graduates	NCEY Graduates Symbols
A	2	A1,AB2*
B	8	B1,BA2*,B3,B4, B5,B6,B7,B8
C	3	C1,C2,C3
D	2	D1,D2
E	2	E1,E2
F	3	F1,F2,F3
G	4	G1,G2,G3,G4
H	3	H1,H2,H3

* Employed by two agencies in study.

CHAPTER III

THE CASE STUDIES

The experiences of the 26 NCEY graduates in the eight agencies were studied in depth, and, with one important exception, revealed remarkable similarities in agency policies and practices toward paraprofessionals. Part Two of this report summarizes and analyzes these similarities, as well as the differences, in detail. To avoid repetition we have mainly confined the case studies that follow to a description of the major impact of paraprofessional employment on each of the NCEY graduates and to the impact they and other paraprofessionals had during their employ on the eight agencies. Hopefully the case studies will give the reader a sense of both the variety and sameness of the situations experienced before proceeding to the general findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

AGENCY A

Agency A is a municipal agency with city-wide responsibility for the prevention and control of drug addiction and the rehabilitation of drug addicts.

The agency, which was established in 1966, operates from a central headquarters in the City Hall area through a complex of neighborhood offices and addiction treatment centers throughout the city. Its staff is composed of individuals selected for their knowledge of the addict personality and their ability to work successfully with addicts. Some are former addicts themselves. The agency places little emphasis on academic degrees for either employment or for promotion. Instead, it actively pursues a policy of internal staff development and promotions from within.

The agency has established a six-level job structure that is continuous from the entry or aide level to the principal specialist or top level of jobs. Since no existing civil service structure was found to meet the agency's needs, it was able to design its own civil service series, which, though still provisional, is close to being accorded permanent status. No distinctions were made initially between paraprofessionals and professionals.

Two NCEY graduates are employed in the agency. Among all the NCEY graduates included in the sample, these two have achieved the highest level, both in terms of status or position and in terms of income. Within the agency's job structure, A-1 has achieved the Grade 5 level, that of a supervising specialist. He has management responsibilities and earns an annual income of $10,300. He currently is acting deputy director of the operations unit and expects to be named as the permanent director shortly. His colleague, AB-2, is at the Grade 4 level, senior specialist. He is earning $ 8,500 a year and serves as corrdinator for the agency's program in a major ghetto area.

Both NCEY graduates in Agency A are young males, respectively 32 and 27 years of age. Both are married and have families. Before enrolling in the NCEY training program, A-1 had completed 15 years of school; AB-2 had not completed high school. At the time the training began, the former was employed as a hospital aide and the latter was unemployed.

For both NCEY graduates, Agency A has provided a maximum opportunity for career advancement and job satisfaction. The agency also assesses their job performance very highly, both in terms of present performance and potential.

A principal feature of the agency's approach to addiction is the use of group encounter techniques which open people to awareness of their own feelings and encourage the expression of emotion. A-1 is both a practitioner and a leader trainer in group encounter techniques, which the agency calls Attitudinal Skills Training. In the agency's view he is first-rate in this role. A-1 is extremely optimistic about his future in the agency. He explains that he has found the right place for himself, a place where he is valued, where his abilities are used to the utmost and where his personal growth is encouraged and rewarded. He sees the agency as a lifetime career opportunity with which he is well satisfied. He notes that the agency has been satisfied with his work and does not require additional education. However he has been thinking about it and would consider completing his college education if some form of assistance and opportunity became available.

NCEY graduate AB-2 is rated by his supervisor as one of the best of the agency's field coordinators. He too is commended for his ability to relate to people and motivate them. His job requires him to organize community groups for the prevention of addiction, as well as to involve addicts in the process of rehabilitation. In these activities, the agency reports his record is outstanding, and he has been asked to develop a master plan for all of the field units. AB-2 also reports that he views the agency as a lifetime career opportunity, that will provide him with ample room to grow. Although he has not completed high school, AB-2 indicates no desire to pursue his education at present.

Agency A is the exception among the agencies referred to throughout this report, It provides exceptional career mobility opportunities for paraprofessionals. It offers unlimited advancement opportunities equal to those generally available only to college graduates. It promotes communication among staff, clients and management consciously. Its structure reflects its policies and its policies reflect a distinct affirmation of the individual's capacity to grow, change and develop.

This agency is also an exception in the way it works with clients and the community as partners. Distinctions between staff and client are blurred when addicts in the process of rehabilitation are "employed" in the addiction treatment center. In the course of the process of moving from addiction to freedom from drugs the rehabilitated addicts become staff members.

Since the agency had no established pool of personnel to draw upon (and retrain), it had to provide for internal staff development to, in effect, grow their own experienced personnel for higher level jobs. On-the-job training is provided to all staff. Promotion policies are premised on the agency's commitment to internal staff development. Lower level staff see models of mobility in higher level staff and can realistically aspire to follow them on the way up, because there are no educational obstacles: "I have made it and so can you" is the point of view.

Agency A has an operational philosophy: the belief in the individual's unlimited capacity to grow, change and develop. The emphasis is on personality growth and positive reinforcement for both addicts and staff. The agency values the ability to interact on a hunan level above all else. This provides the basis for selection of employees and formal education is generally considered extraneous if not irrelevant in the selection process. Indeed to the extent that formal education develops rational faculties at the expense of emotional awareness, it is viewed as a handicap.

Experience in its first few years of existence has convinced Agency A of the soundness of its approach. NCEY graduates, who would still be paraprofessionals in other agencies, have moved into upper level jobs and are regarded as high ranking staff members with no references to any deficits in education. The agency thus has no plans to shift its employment standards toward greater emphasis on formal education.

Why was Agency A able to accomplish more for the NCEY graduates than any other agency under study? Why was it the only one to provide truly unlimited opportunities within its structure for career advancement? Perhaps the most significant factor is that it is not a traditional agency dealing with traditional problems. The nature of the problem requires an approach and a type of personnel different from that found in the usual agency.

In addition Agency A was a totally new agency, unlike most other agencies under study which although using paraprofessionals for new services were themselves established institutions. Thus Agency A did not have to challenge old policies, break down old structures, soften old arteries. Rather than having to alter or accomodate to an entrenched bureacratic system, it could design its entire career ladder based solely on the services it wanted to provide and it could choose its own manpower based solely on the actual abilities needed to peform --or to learn how to perform--the tasks required to deliver those services. And that is precisely what Agency A did.

AGENCY B

Agency B was the principal employer of NCEY graduates. It is a multi-purpose agency located in a major ghetto area. It provides a range of services to clients with emphasis on youth and the prevention of delinquency. It seeks to deal with the causes rather than the consequences of pathology.

Agency B is a voluntary agency,operating through federal funding. It was established as a demonstration program several years before the NCEY training program. It therefore predates the other large multi-service community-based programs which employed NCEY graduates, all of which operate with funds provided by the Economic Opportunity Act for community action programs.

At the time of the NCEY study, Agency B was in the final phases of closing down several divisions of its operations. Its entire future was uncertain. Local community action programs were assuming responsibility and were receiving available funding to operate program addressing the same objectives.

In 1965 and 1966, when the NCEY training program was in operation, Agency B sharply contrasted with most voluntary agencies in its practice of employing paraprofessionals in a wide range of jobs. The NCEY training program, in turn, was then unique in providing generic training in the human services for people without formal education who "like to work with people." Agency B served as an on-the-job training center for a substantial number of NCEY trainees. It subsequently employed a number of trainees assigned to the agency.

A total of ten NCEY graduates were employed by Agency B. Eight of them were available for interviews. However, at the time of the study, only three NCEY graduates were still employed there: B-1, B-3 and B-4.

These three NCEY graduates are young men; two are thirty, one is twenty-nine. Two have been employed continuously by the agency since graduation for four years. The third, B-4, joined Agency B two years ago. This length of employment is reflected in the incomes received by the three graduates: B-1 and B-3 earn $ 8,193 and $ 8,131, respectively; B-4 earns $ 7,463, despite the fact that he has the highest educational achievements and a social work degree from Cuba. The others are both high school graduates, although B-3 was taking college courses when he enrolled at NCEY and continues to do so.

B-1 and B-3 have been continuously in the same job functions throughout the four-year period. As they reached the upper income limits with a particular job classification, their jobs were reclassified and they received a higher rating, and became eligible for a new series of increments. Both have received two such reclassifications in the course of their employment at Agency B. The agency job structure allows for this, by setting up qualifications for higher level jobs on the basis of academic degrees, but allowing for the exemption of previously employed staff from meeting educational requirements through the proviso that "equivalent experience" is acceptable.

B-4 had just been transferred to a new job function at the time of the study. The program which had initially employed him had been phased out through lack of funds; he was transferred to a new program operating under new funds to demonstrate a new approach to community development; training residents to serve as their own advocates for services and for changes to improve services.

At the close of four years, B-1 and B-3 reported limited satisfaction with their experiences. Awareness that the agency was closing down much of its operations presented them with the need to line up alternative employment opportunities elsewhere. They were conscious of the fact that they were receiving higher incomes at Agency B than they might expect in other human service agencies as parparofessional employees. And they were naturally reluctant to face the prospect of reducing their incomes in order to secure employment. Their supervisors credited them with performing their jobs well. They themselves reported that they were performing satisfactorily and knew their jobs thoroughly. Both B-1 and B-3 were in job functions which were highly structured: one conducted intake interviews and the other was a job evaluator, testing a variety of manual skills so that the test results could be used in career counseling for young people. The long-range interests of both NCEY graduates was in the area of community development and participation, interests they each pursued outside the agency and, in the case of B-3, through formal study. The agency provided them with no opportunity to utilize these skills and to further these interests.

Among the NCEY graduates who are no longer with the agency, three are out of the labor market, one became disabled as a result of an automobile accident, another is on maternity leave and the third has returned to school:

B-8, the NCEY graduate who has returned to school, was a woman of thirty-nine, who came from Latin America. She worked as a teaching assistant in a remedial education program. She worked with Spanish-speaking youngsters in an effort to increase their fluency in English. She reports that the job provided her with the motivation for a teaching career, although she was quite critical of limitations imposed on her role as a teaching assistant. She nevertheless reports a high level of satisfaction with her post-NCEY experience and with her future career prospects in teaching.

B-5, the NCEY graduate disabled in an automobile accident, reported a high level of satisfaction with his job at Agency B. He too was a job evaluator testing manual skills. He liked working with his hands. His supervisor indicated that he displayed great aptitude in the field of job evaluation and potential. Had the accident notoccurred, B-5"s supervisor would have encouraged him to secure academic training and become a professional job evaluator.

B-6, who is presently on maternity leave, is a young woman of 32. Although she had completed only eleven years of schooling when she enrolled in the NCEY training program, she displayed outstanding ability on the job and was cited by the agency as a most outstanding staff member. She was assigned to work in Job Corps recruitment and enrollment, and on the basis of her performance, was given increasing responsibility and autonomy. In fact, when a subsequent NCEY enrollee was placed in the agency for on-the-job training, he was assigned to B-6 for supervision. He credited her for providing him with excellent training and commented to the interviewer on the high esteem with which she was held in the agency.

The final salaries for B-5, B-6, and B-8 were respectively $ 7,343, $6,894 and $ 5,500. These reflect the limit of achievable salary for the period of employment in the agency. On the basis of the experience of the NCEY graduates still employed by Agency B, it could be expected that these salaries would have continued to advance had they remained in the agency.

Only two NCEY graduates employed by Agency B have moved on to other agencies. These are BA-2 and B-7. BA-2 is a young man currently employed at Agency A, where he has achieved a high level of job satisfaction and success. In Agency B, he was assigned to a remedial education unit as a teaching assistant. His supervisor was critical of his lack of interest in completing his own high school education, therefore he could see no career for him the field of teaching. He praised him however for his ability to relate to youth, to establish communication, and to involve youngsters in the program. These are the same skills that he is utilizing while employed at Agency A.

B-7, who also had not completed high school, was reported by his supervisor to be a shy, serious, hard-working family man. Spanish-speaking, he enjoyed assisting youth in the realization of greater opportunity. He was assigned to work with Job Corps recruitment and enrollment. Because of his concern for the needs of his family, he left Agency B when the prospect of the phasing out of the Job Corps program was imminent. He took a job with a social services department in a hospital which afforded job security on a permanent basis, even though it meant a reduction in income by $ 200 from the $ 6,200 that he was earning at Agency B. He reports that the job change has actually resulted in increasing his family income by some $ 2,000 per year, because the hours he works at the hospital enables him to hold a second job for 25 hours a week. He credits the NCEY training program and his experiences at Agency B with providing him with career opportunities which had not been available to him.

In any overall assessment of Agency B as a career opportunity for paraprofessionals, it must be noted at the time of the NCEY training program, the agency provided a maximum of opportunity in that it employed large numbers of paraprofessionals in a range of program services and provided generous increases in income for long-term employees.

From the retrospective vantage point of today, however, it did not provide well for career advancement opportunities. The agency's supervisors or executives were not able to advise NCEY graduates on alternative sources of employment when their jobs were being phased out. They did not provide career counseling nor assist paraprofessionals to secure special training or additional education which could increase their opportunities for career advancement in the future.

In the view of a number of the agency's executives, this was a serious shortcoming. They credited the agency for providing opportunities for paraprofessionals to demonstrate that they could perform well on the job without higher education degrees. On an individual basis, however, they were critical of the fact that opportunities to work with greater autonomy and at higher salaries were not accomplished by training or additional education. They were also critical of the fact that the agency had not developed true alternatives to education qualifications; they did not define what they regarded as "equivalent experience". They did not establish performance standards nor delineate prerequisite skills for higher level jobs. Such standards, in the view of several agency executives, would have enabled NCEY graduates, with assistance from the agency, to engage in career planning and would have motivated them to acquire the needed skills or knowledge or experience or job-related study. As it was they lacked aspiration to advancement.

In addition, although Agency B provided striking salary advancement there was little if any advancement in terms of job functions or responsibilities. In some cases job titles were changed in accordance with increases in salary levels, but when looked at closely the tasks performed were found to be exactly what they had been three or four years ago. As a result of the continuous salary increases without true job advancement, NCEY graduates forced to look for jobs under threat of the agency's demise were facing great problems finding opportunities at their salary levels for which their experience at Agency B had qualified them; they were greatly concerned about their future.

Although Agency B pioneered in the use of paraprofessionals, no changes in personnel policies could be discerned which indicated a shift in roles for paraprofessionals and professionals or an expansion of the role for paraprofessionals in agency management and policy making. With length of service came greater autonomy in job functions according to standard practices but no greater opportunities to innovate or modify those practices. A number of NCEY graduates were critical of the fact that they were forbidden to make program adaptations (e.g., introduce ethnic history into remedial education curricula) or to establish interpersonal relationships in intake which would enable the paraprofessionals to function as the intra-agency advocate of the client.

On the other hand, the paraprofessional remained an integral part of the agency's job structure from its very first days until now. Experience with them through the years, however, did not seem to diminish nor expand the role mapped out for them. Clear differ-entiation between professionals and paraprofessionals was maintained, and the feeling among professionals appeared to prevail that the paraprofessional role in Agency B--with opportunities to perform a variety of tasks designated as professional in other institutional settings-signified a significant and democratic approach toward people of limited education.

The view of Agency B in its closing stages today reveals a recognition that these opportunities could have been of more permanent value had true career ladders been provided for paraprofessionals, particularly for those that must now seek jobs elsewhere. The shortcomin has been recognized, however, at a time when the agency is phasing out operations and is not in a position to modify its own practices sufficiently to benefit the NCEY graduates.

AGENCY C

Agency C is a large community action agency operating a variety of programs in a major ghetto area. Established in 1965, it currently receives delegated OEO funds from New York City as a community corporation.

As a program under the Economic Opportunity Act, one of Agency C's initial mandates had been to provide "maximum feasible participation" of the poor in all phases of its operation, as well as to increase their training and job opportunities. As one of its ways of complying, Agency C established a massive on-the-job training program, hired paraprofessionals at the entry level and designated them as trainees. These paraprofessionals were paid stipends instead of salaries and were not eligible for the benefits available to regular employees such as vacations and paid sick leave. At the time of our study, however, this policy had been abandoned; the trainee designation had been dropped and all staff--paraprofessional and professional-- received the same benefits.

An elaborate job classification structure is now operative. It contains 144 classified positions arranged according to twenty grades with minimum salaries starting at $ 3,640 and the maximum at $ 25,380 for the executive director. Of the twenty grades, the first eight may be characterized as paraprofessional classifications. Of the 144 job classifications, 59 (41%) fall within the paraprofessional range.

The jobs above grade 8 are considered by the agency to be professional, and professional almost exclusively is defined as requiring a minimum of a bachelor's degree. At the present time the agency's personnel procedures and practices manual classifies the jobs according to grades; it does not provide classifications according to career lines. Furthermore, the job descriptions for each of the 144 jobs do not identify lower classification jobs as possible prerequisites for higher level jobs.

The agency centrally does not provide career counseling to its employees. Essentially, horizontal movement within the agency is dependent upon the initiative of the employees to secure information for themselves about available openings in other sections of the agency. Vertical movement is mainly dependent upon the opportunities provided by the department or program in which the parparofessional is employed. However, such movement is generally limited to the first eight grades, and the maximum salary to be achieved is $ 8,176 for paraprofessionals.

The agency reports that it is in the process of shifting its emphasis from traditional social work service concepts to those of economic development. It seeks to become the nerve center through which private and public funds can be channeled to generate economic growth in the community, to train residents for high paying jobs and to promote new business and industry in the community which could provide employment. The population served by Agency C is greater than that of many major cities in the country. Its role in relation to the community is somewhat close to quasigovernmental in terms of its expressed purpose in promoting economic growth for the community and economic well being for its residents.

Although four NCEY graduates were employed by Agency C, one is working in a program which functions as almost a separate agency under the multi-program umbrella, and will be reported on as part of Agency D to enable comparison with another NCEY graduate in the same program.

None of the three other NCEY graduates were found to be actually at work at Agency C at the time of the study. C-1 was still employed by the agency, but on sick-leave; C-2, after a short period of employment as a community organizer, left the agency to work for another community action program; C-3, after a short term of employment in the agency's day-care program, left the agency and is now unemployed and on welfare once again.

In terms of income, C-3 ranked lowest among NCEY graduates. She was employed at $ 3,952 and was still at the same level when she resigned six months later. C-2 is earning $ 7,000 at her present job. C-1, who has held a number of different jobs within Agency C, was earning $ 8,000 on his most recent assignment.

A man of 46, C-1 is the oldest NCEY graduate employed at Agency C, and the least educated, having completed only ten years of schooling. C-2, a woman of thirty-five, had completed 15 years of school when she enrolled in the NCEY training program. She plans to resume her education in the fall and complete her degree at a special college operated by her religious denomination. C-3, a woman of 42, is a high school graduate. She has no plans at the present time to pursue her career or secure additional education.

Although occupied with family responsibilities, C-2 reported a high level of activity in the community with welfare rights groups, parents groups and consumer groups. During her period of employment at Agency C, she was highly critical of its practices and sought, found or created opportunities to induce internal change. A zealous reformer, C-2 felt responsible, according to her own reports (confirmed by the agency), for seeking out wrongdoing in Agency C and seeing to it that the public was made aware so that action was taken. As a consequence her term of employment at Agency C (and now in her present job) was stormy. Agency C regards her as able, intelligent and skilled, but was clearly dissatisfied with serving as the target for her reformer's zeal. Staff was unable to find a role within the agency which would focus her energy on targets outside.

Thus it is only with C-1--the one NCEY graduate still employed at Agency C-- that it was possible to measure the agency as an opportunity for career advancement. Yet even in this instance, the match of agency and NCEY graduate was not such as to effectively illustrate the opportunities available for paraprofessionals within the agency. Over the course of three different job assignments in the agency, C-1 was reported as being unable to take supervision or to follow instructions. The agency viewed him as a man of potential and ability who was obstructed by his own negative attitudes from advancing and taking advantage of the opportunities provided by the agency. When Agency C terminated his employment last year, he appealed his case to the board and secured a reversal. The agency was instructed to reinstate him. This decision took place shortly before the NCEY study. When C-1 was interviewed, he was in ill-health suffering from an allergic skin condition, unable to work, and on sick-leave prior to reinstatement. He is expected by the agency to resume employment when he recovers. He reported to NCEY's interviewer that this was his intention as well.

The agency's own assessment of its experience with paraprofessionals after several years is that there is a need to institute aptitude testing, career counseling and supplementary education on a systematic basis, directed at qualifying them for higher level jobs. This is the intention, although it was noted that there are now no funds nor are any expected for this purpose. So, despite the existence of many job titles, there continues to be an emphasis on college degrees as eligibility for higher level jobs. The impact of the experience then, after four years of using paraprofessionals is to seek to enable people to meet the old requirements rather than to establish different standards of eligibility.

In any event the future for paraprofessional opportunities within Agency C looks very poor. As noted earlier, more and more the agency has begun to shift its emphasis away from traditional social services and toward economic development programs. This reflects not only changes in priorities on the basis of service needs, but also a realistic assessment of what new federal funds are likely to be available for. In addition, the agency's role in the community has been challenged by the arrival of other agencies, such as a private non-profit development corporation and a model cities agency. Its early position as the major recipient of federal funds in the community has been superceded and it now feels a need to compete agressively for available funds, diversifying its program if need be to qualify.

Instead of expanding paraprofessional opportunities, Agency C is becoming increasingly a conduit through which residents can receive aptitude tests and counseling and be directed into public and private training and manpower programs. Thus local residents seeking paraprofessional career opportunities are now more likely to be employed through the agency than within it.

AGENCY D

Agency D is a designation used for a national child development program operating with federal funds as a self-contained unit or "sub-agency" under diverse sponsorship throughout New York City. The program provides a wide range of activities and services to preschool children and to their parents and families.

Funded, like Agency C, under a legislative act calling for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor, the program was structured from the very beginning to provide opportunities for paraprofessionals. Indeed the ratio of paraprofessional to professional staff was to favor the former.

However for the first several years after its inception, the tendency of the professional staff in such programs had been to assign paraprofessionals to menial and servile tasks, such as clean-up or escort services. This practice led to the expansion of federal guidelines to insure that opportunities for paraprofessionals would be meaningful. The concern continued to grow until, most recently, the establishment of career ladders has become mandatory for all agencies operating the program under local sponsorship. Individual career plans for paraprofessionals are also required and limited amounts of federal funds are provided for job-related higher education for paraprofessionals leading to an associate arts degree.

The objective of the career ladder and career plans is to enable paraprofessionals to move up progressively as they acquire education and experience to the professional level. However in Agency D most of its professional positions--teacher, psychologist, education director, and social worker--require specific or specialized training and bachelor's or graduate level degrees.

The attainment of an associate degree will not, therefore, be enough to qualify the current paraprofessionals for professional jobs and it is not currently clear what kind of job it will qualify them for. The classic career ladder, going from aide to assistant to associate to intern to fully qualified professional, would be best suited to this agency. However its successful implementation requires that additional funds be provided for salary increases as individuals acquire the academic credits for higher level designations and for higher level education opportunities above the associate level for all paraprofessions who qualify and choose to pursue further education. At the present time the federal funding source has not granted monies for these purposes and budgetary limitations are the largest obstacle to expanding opportunities.

Two NCEY graduates have been employed for several years in Agency D's programs, which operates under different sponsors. As was noted earlier, one NCEY graduate worked in a unit under the umbrella of Agency C.

Both NCEY graduates employed in Agency D are women of 43 years of age. D-1 was a high school graduate; D-2 had completed eleven years of school. Neither NCEY graduate was involved in agency-centered activities for children. Both work with parents, involving them with center activities, helping them to develop themselves and to overcome problems in the family, the home and the community. They also assist families in securing services from other agencies.

At the time of the NCEY study, the local sponsors of Agency D were in the process of trying to comply with the new federal mandate to establish career plans for each individual employee and to establish career ladders in their agencies which would enable paraprofessionals to move continuously upward. However, the findings indicated that neither of the local sponsors had succeded in establishing either career plans for the NCEY graduates or career ladders for their agencies.

One sponsor had nominally promoted D-1 to a position of assistant director. However, the agency lacked the funds for a full-time position at this level. As a result, they promoted her in title and in hourly salary, but reduced the number of hours she works each week to twenty. Thus, she has realized a nominal increase over her starting wage level and a more substantial increase in title. The agency rates her performance highly and she is enthusiastic about her role in the program. Her actual salary for half time is $ 4,470; on a full-time basis this would annualize at $ 8,940, placing her in the upper level of salary and position achieved by NCEY graduates. According to D-1, she has advanced her career significantly since completing training at NCEY. She expects to enroll in the near future in a higher education program, sponsored by the federal funding source at a local university, leading to an associate degree. However, the employer agency has not yet established a higher-level job or salary for a holder of this degree.

D-2, also reported a great deal of satisfaction with her job and her employer rates her as a highly valued employee. On the basis of demonstrated ability to do the job, D-2 should be eligible for promotion, according to her supervisor. However, the sponsoring agency currently requires a baccalaureate degree for holders of the next level job, that of social worker. D-2's sponsoring unit is trying to establish a career ladder with alternative requirements but under current budgetary limitations has not yet succeded. The agency is also attempting to redefine job requirements to provide higher-level jobs for holders of the associate arts degree. Since D-2, because of family responsibilities, is not scheduled to enroll in the higher education program, her supervisor believes she may remain ineligible for promotion under the new or restructured career ladder, despite the fact that her present performance warrants immediate promotion.

Thus although Agency D varies from other agencies employing NCEY graduates in that its promotion policies are influenced by the federal mandate requiring that paraprofessionals have continuing opportunities for advancement, its practices up to the time of the study were not found to vary from those of the other agencies. Agency D's sponsors still have structural prohibitions which continue to foreclose opportunities for advancement.

Interviews were also held with the federal funding source and with staff at the university providing the education opportunities. The university staff reported that the education program was being undermined by the inability of the agency's sponsors to reward educational achievements with wage increases or promotions. They indicated that the responsibilities of a full-time job, college work and family needs impose heavy burdens on paraprofessionals. To maintain morale and sustain motivation, enrollees must have assurance that concrete rewards await holders of the A.A. degree. The federal funding source concurred with this view. In response to the sponsor's requests for assistance in designing career plans and establishing career ladders, special consultants providing technical assistance will be made available to local agencies. Also a federal guideline is being established so that national standards for nominal wage increments will be provided to college enrollees as they complete units of study.

In summary, Agency D, though not different in practice from most of the other agencies at the time of the study in terms of the limits set to opportunities for paraprofessional advancement, was found to demonstrate the strongest commitment to change. Though unmet, the mandate for change is clear. The federal funding source requires it, will provide technical assistance to bring it about and will provide supplementary education to enable employees to move up the career ladder. A key need now is for the funds for the individual agencies to really do the job.

AGENCY E

Agency E operates a community mental health program as a storefront service of a voluntary hospital located in a major ghetto. It is affiliated with a university and a medical school. The employment of paraprofessionals is an integral part of this service, which was conceived of as a partnership between community residents and the hospital.

The program aims to deal with the causes of anxiety and mental problems. It is not concerned with helping people to adjust to problems but rather with providing advocacy and assistance to individuals in overcoming and eliminating problems to the extent that it is possible. The range of the problems with which the agency deals includes housing, education, welfare and employment. Helping individuals to act upon oppressive problems and begin to solve them is viewed as a necessary adjunct to the treatment of mental health problems.

The services provided through storefront community mental health centers are staffedbyteams of professionals and paraprofessionals. Intake is done on a rotating basis with paraprofessionals playing key roles in the intake procedure. Paraprofessionals also function as advocates of clients in dealing with a wide range of other agencies and services, and are required to be resourceful in helping clients to locate sources of assistance and secure needed help. They function as agents or representatives of the clients in relation to services within the agency itself as well as outside.

The agency's professional staff consists of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and medical doctors who provide specialized services to clients. Although there is no continuity between the paraprofessional career line and that of the professionals, there are three paraprofessional job levels:

1. Community Mental Health Worker
2. Senior Community Mental Health Worker
3. Supervising Community Mental Health Worker

Within each grade there are annual increments and individuals are eligible for promotion to the next level when they reach the end of a salary scale in the lower level.

Two NCEY graduates are employed in Agency E. They have been there for three-and-a-half and four years respectively. Both are mature woman, 37 and 42 years of age. E-1 is a high school graduate while E-2 has only completed ten years of schooling. Both are enrolled in the supplementary education program and are working towards an associate arts degree. E-2 will acquire her high school equivalency certificate in the course of college study and will retroactively receive credits for work completed prior to receipt of the certificate. The college works closely with the agency in the development of courses relating to mental health and there will be heavy emphasis on psychology and studies of behavior included in the curriculum. Although the agency itself is affiliated with a university which includes a liberal arts college, it does not provide a course of study leading to an associate arts degree, and the agency has to contract from educational services with an institution that does.

For most of the period since completing training at NCEY, both graduates employed at Agency E worked at storefront community mental health centers. Both graduates were highly enthusiastic about their work, the importance of the service they were providing and the value to the community of the agency. In the fall of 1968, however, one NCEY graduate was appointed as an assistant trainer in the training program the agency operates for paraprofessionals, work which she found far less satisfying. Interviews revealed that her job functions were not as clearly defined and it appeared that she lacked opportunities to display initiative or to work independently as she had in the storefront centers.

The salary scale at this agency, with its three levels of opportunity and wide ranges of increments, places the NCEY graduates there in the high middle income range. They earn $ 7,404 and $ 7,040 respectively. Their entry level salaries were $ 4,212 and $ 3,700. These paraprofessionals were unemployed prior to enrolling in the NCEY training program.

After the interviews were conducted at Agency E, a strike was called for all employees. The original impetus for the strike was the alleged arbitrary dismissal of several paraprofessionals. It soon developed that the dominant issues were larger roles for the community in policy making and administration of the program, and also expansion of opportunities for paraprofessionals, who perceived of themselves as representatives of the community within the agency. The strike, which lasted for many weeks, polarized the staff with some professionals joining forces with paraprofessionals against the administration. Charges of colonial exploitation were leveled against the hospital and the sponsoring university and medical school. Charges of exploitation were also leveled at non-resident professionals for using the job opportunity as a stepping stone for better jobs elsewhere, and for not being committed to serving the community on a long-range basis or in careers dedicated to the development of services in the community.

In the course of the strike and in its subsequent aftermath, it became difficult to reconcile conflicting reports and arrive at simple explanations, verifiable by opposing parties in the dispute. What did become clear was that the management of the program changed, on an interim basis. The administrator was replaced by a triumvirate which included a representative of the paraprofessionals. The future management of the program and the future of its affiliations with the hospital and university complex were not determined at the time the study was completed. Whether the program will continue under a new new affiliation, under the old affiliation with changes, or whether it will be phased out are three possible outcomes.

The NCEY graduates in Agency E did not play a dominate role in the conflict, although they supported the strike in its early stages. At the time of the study their primary concern was whether the agency would continue and thereby whether opportunities for them to advance would continue.

In Agency E, the community role was emphasized from the onset and paraprofessionals, as agents of the community, worked as partners or team members of professionals. It was found that professionals worked as generalists along with the paraprofessionals on the teams, as well as specialists in the fields in which they were trained. Equal partnerships part of the time coupled with unequal opportunities for paraprofessionals to participate in the establishment of policy (or in partnership with administration) had a cumulative negative impact.

The community in which the agency is based could be described as either highly dynamic or volatile. Within its community action and model cities programs demands have been made with great militancy for the right to govern their own affairs and to administer all services to the community. This thrust has been reflected in the upheaval at Agency E.

Because the professionals in Agency E can be truly categorized as professionals (social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, etc.), the agency can only expand paraprofessional opportunities by removing professionals from the performance of generalist functions, or by providing paraprofessionals with the necessary higher education opportunities (including advanced degrees) which would enable them to meet professional standards. Otherwise expanded opportunities for paraprofessionals would have to be in the area of administration and management. These are complicated issues, aired openly, but not yet dealt with.

The agency's experience has also brought to light the issue of community input on policymaking and has raised the question of whether such input should come principally from community residents not employed as paraprofessionals. The issue of who speaks for the community is integrally related to the drive to increase opportunities for paraprofessionals.

AGENCY F

Agency F is a large hospital in a major ghetto. Formerly a municipal hospital, it recently became a voluntary hospital under the sponsorship of a major university. In recent years the agency has been confronted with a multitude of problems which are not central to this study. However some of the consequences of its efforts to deal with these problems have had a direct impact upon NCEY graduates and other paraprofessionals employed there. Of particular significance, as will be shown, has been the affiliation with the university.

Local drives for community participation, decentralization and greater responsiveness to community needs, as well as the thrust for increased employment opportunities for community residents in local services, have also had an impact upon Agency F and the NCEY paraprofessionals it employs.

In the past few years the agency's social services staff has been expanded from 33 to 100 employees. At present three NCEY graduates are employed by Agency F, all within this social services department.

F-1 and F-3 are woman, respectively 47 and 55 years of age. They are both high school graduates. F-2, at 27, is one of the youngest NCEY graduates included in the sample. His education stopped at the 9th grade.

All three NCEY graduates currently earn $ 6,300 per year. All three have worked continuously for Agency F since completing their NCEY training two-and-one-half years ago.

In Agency F's social services department, the NCEY graduates work as part of social service teams, headed by graduate social workers who hold MSW degrees, and also including social work associates who have baccalaureate degrees, and social work assistants who are paraprofessionals.

When the NCEY graduates were first employed at Agency F, it was not yet affiliated with the university and its school of social work. Since this affiliation was made, the staffing pattern has been modified and the social work associates-young college graduates -- were added. As a consequence many tasks initially performed by paraprofessionals-- such as screening and interviewing incoming and outgoing patients-- were assigned to this new category of staff. While the objective was to upgrade the level of service in the agency, the consequence for paraprofessionals was to be made ineligible for work they had performed previously, presumably on a satisfactory basis, because they lacked a baccalaureate degree. This change naturally had an adverse effect upon morale.

Then a shortage of professional staff, combined with the fact that paraprofessionals actually worked better with the patients, induced the agency to give these functions back to the paraprofessionals. And paraprofessionals began to demonstrate: Either they were performing professional functions or the professionals had been performing paraprofessional functions. They were willing to perform the tasks, again, but they wanted more money and more status. This issue is still unsettled.

Further conflicts resulted from the great disparity in salaries paid to the social work associates and thos e paid the assistants. In addition opportunities for higher education were offered to the associates, who already had college degrees, to work for master's degrees and thus increase their mobility within the agency, while no assistance was provided to paraprofessionals to acquire baccalaureate degrees.

The responses of the NCEY graduates in Agency F to the disparity of opportunities varied considerably. F-3, a woman of 55 has on her own initiative decided to attend college and work for a bachelor's degree. She has been accepted as a part-time student, scheduled to attend classes in September, while still carrying a full work load at Agency F. The agency has agreed to vary her work schedule, allowing her to work evenings and Saturdays so that she can attend classes in the late afternoon. She is a woman of tremendous energy and drive who decided that if the system requires credentials for professional advancement, she will "go the whole route," and get them.

F-2, a young man with only nine years of formal education, has no current plans to return to school. However, he has become active in the agency's union and is an elected delegate for social service employees, professional as well as paraprofessional. In this capacity, he plans to work to improve opportunities and conditions for paraprofessionals.

F-1 is more accepting of the status quo. She is highly regarded by patients and staff (as are the other NCEY graduates). A community resident, living across the street from the hospital, she enjoys her job and the satisfaction provided by the work. She is not as future-oriented as F-3 and is sufficiently satisfied with a meaningful job opportunity not to set herself the difficult goal of becoming a full-fledged professional.

Agency F was found to be lively and growing. It is aggressively seeking to upgrade its standing as an institution responsive to the needs of the community. In the area of social services, the agency was found to be in the process of re-examining its capacity to deliver services, to more effectively utilize personnel, and to expand opportunities for advancement. During the time of the study, the agency shut down temporarily to protest against funding cuts. Changes which could benefit paraprofessionals are not yet visible. The agency reported that the establishment of a permanent classification for paraprofessionals was on the agenda for the future.

Thus, the findings indicate that limited opportunities exist for paraprofessionals at Agency F at the present time. They are permanent employees, they are represented in the union, they come from a community which is expected to have a greater voice in the agency. Experience has demonstrated their value and importance, but as of the moment the agency has not expanded their role and status and opportunities as a result.

AGENCY G

Agency G is a large municipal agency in the field of public service employment. It is responsible for recruitment, selection, testing, classification and placement of government employees. In these areas of major responsibilities, no paraprofessionals are employed.

Paraprofessionals were initially hired by the agency in 1965, when the agency was given responsibility for the placement and supervision of youth assigned to public agencies under a federally funded youth employment program. To meet these responsibilities, paraprofessionals were hired to work within the agency. Their salaries were paid with federal funds delegated by another public agency which has overall responsibility for the program.

It is of historic interest that the decision to employ paraprofessionals in Agency G can be traced to NCEY's training program. An agency executive reports that at the time they were considering hiring paraprofessionals, they learned of the NCEY training program, which could provide trained paraprofessional job candidates. Using the NCEY training program as a criterion for eligibility, the agency established a new non-competitive civil service series. Paraprofessional employees were provisional, since funding was on a year-to-year basis and the future of the program and thereby the jobs for paraprofessionals within the agency were not assured.

Four NCEY graduates were hired by Agency G. Three of them are still there and have been there for close to four years. In the course of their employment within the agency, a new public agency was created in New York City which employs large numbers of paraprofessionals. For this new agency, a new civil service series was designed that would meet the needs of its staff. This series is still provisional, awaiting the development of appropriate civil service examinations.

When the new series was established provisionally, Agency G arranged to have its paraprofessional employees graded at the series' entry level. However, the budget did not provide for more than one job level for Agency G's paraprofessional employees. Thus, though nominally part of a larger civil service series, NCEY graduates in Agency G still have single level opportunities available to them.

The agency reports that it is seeking to have these jobs upgraded. On the basis of performance, experience and scope of responsibilities, the positions held by NCEY graduates should be reclassified at a higher level. But at the time of the study, this upgrading had not occurred. Only by leaving the agency, and transferring to a public agency utilizing the full paraprofessional civil service series, could an NCEY graduate advance. After the interviews were completed, one NCEY graduate did transfer from Agency G to the agency with overall responsibility for the youth employment program (which it delegated in part to Agency G). Thus, she is working in substantially the same job, though in a different agency, at a higher rating and a higher salary.

Of the four NCEY graduates employed by Agency G, three are women. G-1 and G-4 are respectively 27 and 29, G-2 is 38, and G-3 is a man of 49. Three of the group are high school graduates, while G-1 completed only 10 years of high school.

G-1 and G-3 have the same job assignment, sharing responsibility for supervising or following up on all in-and-out-of-school enrollees in the youth employment program. The work load is large, but the agency indicated that they were thoroughly familiar with their work and able to perform satisfactorily.

G-2, after initially working with her fellow NCEY graduates, became the assistant to a man responsible for providing information to communities on employment opportunities in the public sector, whether municipal, state or federal, and for providing training to trainers in locally based civil service test pereparation programs. She also participates in job fairs and other related activities which bring information to job seekers about employment opportunities in the public sector.

The fourth NCEY graduate, G-4, was terminated by the agency under unpleasant circumstances. In accord with her dismissal, she felt that she had undermined the position of other paraprofessionals and that as a result their behavior would be more closely monitored.

Agency G provided continuing work opportunities to the NCEY graduates. Their earnings however at the time of the study were only slightly more than $ 5,000, which places them in the lowest range of NCEY graduates. This is about a $ 300 raise in more than four years of employment. In addition, the fact that they are still in a provisional status in an agency governed by civil service means that they are in an unprotected position. Their employment can be terminated, they are not eligible for many benefits, they are not eligible for union membership, and they do not receive credit for their period of employment. The fact that the civil service test which could secure them permanent positions is not yet available, intensified the uncertainty and the anxiety of their role. They have no assurance that they will be able to pass the test, since they do not know what it will contain.

In Agency G the strict distinction between professionals and paraprofessionals has been maintained in numerous ways in addition to the overriding fact that the paraprofessional function is a single-level appendage to the agency's continuous job structure. The position itself was not created to fulfill an aspect of the agency's basic function. Instead it was created to fulfill auxillary responsibilities assigned to it by a federally funded program operating mainly out of other agencies. These responsibilities might at any time be removed from the agency. If this occurs, all but one paraprofessional would be withdrawn from Agency G.

Thus far, therefore, the paraprofessional has achieved only a temporary and marginal place in Agency G. Their high performance level raises questions about the need for more opportunities for for paraprofessionals as the agency seeks to deliver increased and better services. But these questions would bring into consideration the larger issue of job restructuring and redesign within this long-established agency and it is unlikely that such an issue will be brought to the table for discussion during this time of retrenchment and cost-cutting in municipal agencies and in the federal government as well.

Agency executives report they are trying to offset the negative factors just described. However, they say this is possible to only a limited extent. Both NCEY graduates and agency staff expressed the hope that their positions will be reclassified soon at a higher level, that the salary will be increased and that the civil service examination barrier can be crossed successfully and quickly. These obstacles make it impossible to address the issue of increasing opportunities for continued mobility. The emphasis, at the moment, is simply on creating permanent employment.

AGENCY H

Long established in the field of employment services, this public agency expanded its activities in the early 60's to provide outreach services to low-income, minority-group members in local communities. To implement this decision, a new category of staff was created, the community worker, a paraprofessional. A non-competitive civil service classification was established with annual increments.

Until this position was established, the agency had two civil service series: one for clerical staff, and one for professional staff.

The new classification was not continuous with either series. It was established above the clerical level, at grade 10, but the first professional classification was rated at grade 14.

No linkage was established between the paraprofessional and professional series. Neither was experience acquired at the paraprofessional level credited towards eligibility for higher level positions. The agency had established the baccalaureate degree as the eligibility requirement for the entry level professional job, with alternatives such as experience in employment service which paraprofessionals could not acquire. This was desite the fact that much of the work actually performed by paraprofessionals within the agency, according to supervisors, provided experience equal to and as relevant as employment agency experience.

Four NCEY graduates have been employed by Agency H, although only three were available for interviews.* All were assigned to job functions which brought them into direct relationships with low income minority group job seekers.

Three NCEY graduates worked in a decentralized service operated by Agency H which concentrates on expanding the opportunities available to youth through active recruitment, counseling, working with families, meeting health needs, securing basic education services, placement in job training programs and actual job placement. This agency, more than any other included in the study, has to establish and maintain wide ranges of relationships with other agencies in order to provide the services needed by its clients. The approach is active advocacy of the clients' interest. Paraprofessionals are used as outreach workers to recruit and follow up clients. Loss of interest on the part of clients is not ignored. The agency through its paraprofessionals seeks to stimulate lagging interest and to identify the obstacles impeding participation, such as family problems, trouble with school, employers, law enforcement agencies, health or addiction.

---

* The fourth, no longer working at Agency H, is not included in the study sample.

Of the three NCEY graduates currently employed in this service, two have been working continuously in the same location for over three years. These two NCEY graduates, currently employed in Agency H's youth service program, are a woman of 38 and a young man of 27.

H-1, the woman, had already completed two years of college when she enrolled in the NCEY program. Family responsibilities for the next few years prevent her from continuing her education. Although the agency does not provide released time, she is eligible for some tuition reimbursement, ranging from 50% for courses not related to her work to 100% for courses directly related. Her supervisor rates her as an extraordinarily able employee with a capacity to advance without limit if she acquired the higher education degree, which serves as the entry within the agency for advancement to higher levels. Her supervisor indicated her belief that H-1's experience as a community worker for three years combined with the two years of college she had completed would make her able to perform the entry level professional job at the present time, but this is not possible.

H-3, the other NCEY graduate employed in the agency's youth program had not gone beyond the 8th grade. Personal problems in his early teens took him out of school, and the NCEY training program provided him with a second chance. His supervisor believes this was his only chance to obtain meaningful job opportunity. According to his supervisor, it required arduous effort on his part and intensive personal effort on the part of the supervisor to improve his skills in organization and communication, so that he could plan his activities effectively and provide agency staff with feedback about clients he works directly with in the field.

The unit of Agency H employing these NCEY graduates is located in a borough outside of Manhattan. The comprehensive services the agency tries to provide requires a high level of team work among staff members, as well as high level communication skills with ghetto youth. The agency has integrated its staff through the introduction of paraprofessionals. Very few young professionals on the staff have first hand knowledge of poverty or come from minority groups. The agency's unit director has been conducting an intensive staff integration program, using group encounter techniques to increase awareness and partnership between minority group paraprofessionals and white professionals. Terms such as paraprofessional and professional are no longer used, and emphasis is placed on creating awareness of the different contributions made by different categories of staff as well as by individuals.

The importance of first hand knowledge of the community in which clients live and the problems that they encounter is underscored so that young college graduates can be freed from the belief that they need to know it all and can become open for learning from staff members from whom they are in partnership relationships, rather

√

than superior to subordinate. The agency is seeking to eliminate the blockage that results from subordinate-superior role relationships in which learning sources are selectively chosen among individuals designated as superior and learning opportunities are foreclosed from sources designated as subordinate.

The integration of operational teams is impeded so long as young professionals have continuous opportunities for advancement and paraprofessionals, regardless of ability, must remain at the entry level. The NCEY graduates' supervisor would like to see a bridge level position established, and experience in the community worker role credited towards eligibility for advancement. This supervisor would like the agency to establish a relationship with a university and develop a work-related higher education program for paraprofessionals which would lead to the bachelor's degree with released time provided. There were no indications that such changes were in the offing.

On an agency-wide basis, the official response to the need to employ minority group members was to hire on a provisional basis college graduates drawn from minority groups who could not pass the civil service test for the entry level jobs. In the course of employment with the agency, these provisional staff members receive additional opportunity to pass the test and assistance in preparing for the test. Thus, it was found that the agency has, at least for the present, chosen to retain the academic credential (the baccalaureate degree) as the primary entry qualification, and has modified its requirement that a civil service test be passed prior to employment. Paraprofessionals within the agency are not eligible to take this test. If they were given the opportunity and succeeded in passing, they could not be employed because they do not hold a baccalaureate degree.

The question of the relevance of civil service tests to the many new roles that staff members in the agency are filling was also brought into discussion. One agency executive noted that knowledge of agency procedures was much more important in the past than it is today. Formerly, most agency activities were selfcontained. Currently, agency activities extend in numerous directions outside the agency. Continually new partnerships and working relationships are forged with other agencies, requiring knowledge not only of the procedures of Agency H but knowledge as well of the procedures and practices and resources of a wide range of other agencies.

The third NCEY graduate employed in Agency H (H-2) has been working since last November in a new program operated by the agency. It is a federally funded program serving welfare recipients, aimed at moving them from unemployability to employability. The agency works closely with enrollees for a minimum of nine months seeing to it that they receive whatever services they require from basic education to training, day care to social services.

Federal guidelines require that any agency operating this program follow a comprehensive approach, establish working relationships with a wide variety of agencies and provide enrollees with personal advocacy, support and follow through for as long as these are required. In this program, the staff is organized on a team basis. Each team consists of two professionals, a paraprofessional and a clerical worker. Functions are differentiated but interaction between team members is frequent to assure continuing feedback.

The NCEY graduate employed in this program was rated very highly by her supervisor who regretted that civil service title restrictions prevented the supervisor from providing the NCEY graduate with opportunities for new learning, in the field of interviewing, for example.

This supervisor also would like to use the team work approach as an opportunity for demonstrating higher level skills and providing learning opportunities for paraprofessionals. She would like to see career ladders established for all members of the team, including clerical workers and believes that a policy of learning on-the-job and promoting from within would be desirable in a new and complex program in which roles are dissimilar from those performed elsewhere in the agency by individuals holding the same titles.

On her own initiative the NCEY graduate in this unit, who is 37 and a high school graduate, is planning to enroll in college in the fall. According to her supervisor she is highly motivated and determined to overcome all obstacles to advancement, despite such difficulties as attending classes without released time. Interestingly, the intensity of her motivation led her supervisor to add one qualification to an otherwise exemplary rating: It was noted that in the initial stages of this new program the NCEY graduate displayed a degree of intolerance towards hard-core welfare recipients who were bogged down by their problems. The fact that she had overcome these obstacles herself as a result of herculean efforts blinded her to the fact that others might not be similarly able to do so. Intensive efforts by the supervisor to develop self-awareness and better understanding of others reduced the problem considerably and enabled her to draw upon her own experiences more effectively rather than to judge others more harshly.

The NCEY graduate who was not available for interview had a one-of-a-kind assignment with the agency. She worked directly with an agency professional in a recruitment drive for a police cadet program. According to her supervisor her record was outstanding.

She recruited a large number of enrollees whose retention level was very high. She demonstrated resourcefulness, ingenuity and the ability to communicate effectively. For her role in this program, she was cited by the Governor. Her supervisor described her as a highly valued employee by any standard, and felt that the paraprofessional designation and limitations that were imposed were too restrictive. In his view, it was understandable and desirable that she seek better opportunities elsewhere. Although she was not available for an interview, it was learned that she is working at a higher salary in her new job than Agency H could provide.

The major impact of paraprofessionals upon Agency H has been to enable the agency to provide outreach services and to more effectively service a client group, which in the past had not been fully served by the agency. While paraprofessionals have had a significant impact upon the delivery of services to low-income members of minority groups, the agency has not modified its initial position regarding paraprofessionals which led to establishing an appendage to its job classification structure which offers no opportunity for advancement. Agency policy regarding paraprofessionals has not been modified to either expand advancement opportunities or to actively encourage the development of paraprofessionals for higher level positions. It is most significant that the experience gained on the job in the paraprofessional role within the agency could not be credited toward eligibility for higher level jobs in the same way that experience in a private employment agency is credited.

A mandate from the agency's federal funding source requires that paraprofessionals receive advancement opportunities or that career ladders be established which include paraprofessional personnel. The agency is not held accountable for developing a plan to promote career advancement.

The relationship between expanding career opportunities for paraprofessionals and recruiting more minority group members as staff is not reflected in agency policies or practices. On the operational level, the need to expand opportunities for paraprofessionals is advocated by supervisors and unit directors. Those who have acquired outreach experience cannot bring this knowledge to higher level jobs. Entry level professionals, on the other hand, and those who move from the entry level to supervisory positions are limited under the present structure to those without community knowledge based on life or outreach experience. Thus the agency is prohibited from maximally utilizing its own resources.

PART TWO

THE FINDINGS

CHAPTER IV

HOW FAR WERE THEY ABLE TO GO?

For the NCEY group as a whole the years following the training program have been years of unquestionable achievement. At the time the twenty-six enrollees entered training, twenty-one were unemployed and five were working at marginal jobs. Today two are unemployed. The great majority can be found firmly established within the human services field.

Indeed the stability of the employment of most of the 26 graduates has been extraordinary. Twenty have been employed by only one agency since completing their training three or four years ago.* Five have had two employers since completing training. (one of these had to leave the first job when there was no longer funding to employ him; three others left for better positions elsewhere.) Only one graduate has moved to more than two jobs since graduation from the NCEY program.

As impressive as this job stability sounds, we should be aware that it may have negative implications in addition to the more obvious positive ones. High employment stability among paraprofessionals was also noted in a recent national study of trainees in New Careers programs by the University Research Corporation. Throughout the nation, and certainly in New York where the NCEY graduates work, opportunities for genuine career advancement for paraprofessionals have been limited; thus the stability noted may be due in part to the lack of better places for paraprofessionals to go.

---

* Three of these are currently out of the labor market; one suffered a permanent disability in an automobile accident; another is on maternity leave; and the third returned to school.

There can be no dispute, however, about the desirability of higher salaries. And, as a whole, the NCEY group has achieved substantial gains since they first started out. With one exception, all the graduates have increased their earnings.*

Table C on the following page compares the current and starting salaries of the individual graduates. For the group as a whole, the average starting salary was $4,534, the average current salary is $6,773--an increase of almost 50%. Table D, also on the following page, illustrates the pattern of upward movement of earnings. When the NCEY graduates entered the paraprofessional job market, the majority earned less than $5,000 per year and not one earned as much as $7,000. Today not one who is employed earns less than $5,000 per year and close to 30% earn more than $ 8,000.

As shown in the case studies of individual agencies in Chapter III and in more detail in Chapter V on tasks performed, the graduates proved to the satisfaction of almost everyone that they were capable of performing the tasks they were given and to the satisfaction of most that they were capable of higher accomplishments as well.

---

* The one graduate whose earnings did not rise was employed for less than one year of the post-training period.

TABLE C

COMPARISON OF STARTING AND CURRENT SALARIES

NCEY GRADUATE'S SYMBOL	CURRENT SALARY	STARTING SALARY	PERCENTAGE GAINED
A1	$10,300	$6,000	72%
AB2	8,500	5,000	70%
B1	8,193	4,160	97%
B3	8,131	5,100	60%
B4	7,463	5,400	38%
B5	7,343	4,160	76%
B6	6,894*	4,160	66%
B7	6,200*	5,200	19%
B8	5,500*	4,600	20%
C1	8,000	6,000	33%
C2	7,000	3,500	100%
C3	3,952*	3,952	0
D1	8,940+	3,000	42%
D2	6,032	3,000	100%
E1	7,404	4,212	76%
E2	7,040	3,700	90%
F1	6,300	5,400	17%
F2	6,300	4,800	31%
F3	6,300	4,800	31%
G1	6,300	4,250	46%
G2	5,250	4,250	24%
G3	5,150	4,250	21%
G4	5,150*	4,250	21%
H1	6,300	4,950	22%
H2	6,300	4,900	22%
H3	5,875	4,900	17%

* Final salary; now unemployed or out of the labor market

+ Annualization of 1/2 time salary; % based on real wages gained.

TABLE D

POST-TRAINING MOVEMENT PATTERNS OF EARNING LEVELS*

Salary Range	Starting Percentage	Current Percentage
under $4,000	19%	0
$4,000-4,999	52%	0
$5,000-5,999	19%	14%
$6,000-6,999	10%	33%
$7,000-7,999	0	24%
$8,000-8,999	0	24%
over $ 9,000	0	5%
	100%	100%

*Comparisons based on differentials of currently employed graduates.

Their very ability makes the most basic finding of this study all the more disappointing: *Within all but one of the agencies under study (Agency A), opportunities for career mobility are either severely limited or completely nonexistent.*

Career advancement opportunities are generally open only to holders of baccalaureate degrees. Job classifications for paraprofessionals, whether one-level or multi-level, are typically appendages with no linkage or continuity with the major job classification systems and offer no opportunities for authentic career advancement.

In two agencies, however, (Agency B and Agency C) there appeared to be some overlapping between the professional and paraprofessional classifications, implying the possibility of mobility. Because these agencies had established elaborate, multi-level, multi-title, multi-grade classifications for personnel*, there was confusion as to whether these were career lines which established continuity of opportunities for both paraprofessional and professional employees.

Initial findings were misleading. There were indications that some NCEY graduates had moved into jobs normally filled by professionals and normally requiring higher educational credentials. But these exceptions tended to obscure the more significant finding that no alternatives to the previous qualifications for these jobs were stated with sufficient clarity to have enabled these or other paraprofessionals to plan for and work toward achieving these positions. The qualifications needed were not spelled out concretely enough for supervisors or training staff within the agencies to plan with paraprofessionals how they might acquire the skills, knowledge or experience to become eligible for such promotions.

---

* One agency has 144 job classifications divided among 20 categories, with paraprofessional opportunities in eight categories.

No standards were found to be established against which promotions based on merit could be distinguished from promotions given on the basis of exemptions from established eligibility requirements. The absence of such standards reveals that none of the agencies has clearly delineated a set of qualifications as alternatives to academic requirements. Although, as noted, there were several murky areas of overlap between career lines to which paraprofessionals and professionals are eligible, the findings do not indicate that these agencies established continuity through career lines.

This conclusion is reinforced by the absence in agencies of programs for internal staff development. As detailed in Chapter VI, no training programs were found which were designed to develop capacities to move to higher levels and no functions in lower level jobs were found to be designed to develop capacities or expand experiences for higher level opportunities.

In the agencies which operate separate and discontinuous systems of advancement for parparofessionals and professionals, some variances were found in the range of opportunities with the paraprofessional system. One agency (Agency E) established a three-part career series for paraprofessionals. However, the examination of the qualifications for each level revealed that annual increments within levels and promotions between levels were based upon duration of employment rather than upon demonstrations of superior performance. Thus, any paraprofessional remaining with the agency for a number of years could expect to be promoted to the highest level; superior paraprofessionals however, could not expect to advance more rapidly than less able ones.

It is open to question whether this agency provides more opportunities for actual career advancement or whether instead it can be said to have simply offered more generous increments to paraprofessionals who remain with the agency for long periods of time. From the agency's point of view, such a policy might tend to hold staff turnover to a minimum. From the paraprofessional point of view, a negative effect of this policy might be to keep individuals from realizing their potential, underutilizing their abilities and deterring them from seeking genuine career advancement opportunities which, however, might not pay as well initially. This assumes of course that such opportunities are available.

Another agency (Agency D) with two levels of opportunities for paraprofessionals operates under a federal mandate to establish career ladders and career plans for employees, but lacks the additional federal funds needed to actually establish higher level jobs to which paraprofessionals might aspire.

In the three remaining agencies (Agencies F,G and H), the opportunities available to paraprofessionals are limited to a single classification. Paraprofessionals or anyone for that matter, without a bachelor's degree are precluded from eligibility for all jobs which the agencies designate as professional.

Unequal opportunities for paraprofessionals and professionals are evident in numerous ways. For example, in two of the three agencies, professionals who hold the bachelor's degree are encouraged and receive assistance, including tuition, to acquire a master's degree. In these agencies, credit for professional experience in lower level jobs is given and applied toward eligibility for higher level jobs. These combined benefits are denied to paraprofessionals. Thus, in the view of many paraprofessionals and agency staff members, a double standard is maintained which serves to keep paraprofessional staff members in disadvantaged positions while promoting advancement for those who enter the agency with higher education degrees that could qualify them with career opportunities elsewhere.

THE PARAPROFESSIONAL SAMPLE: WHY INDIVIDUAL RATES OF PROGRESS DIFFER

One expected outcome of the study was that careful analysis of the interviews with the twenty-six NCEY graduates, and with the staff in the eight agencies would reveal differential levels and rates of progress among career pathways. It was assumed that the group experience would reflect variations in individual abilities to adapt to new roles as well as differences in opportunities caused by variations in agency structures, functions, policies, job titles and settings.

Thus, at the outset, attempts were made to group trainees into three categories that would indicate current or future career development. We planned to show the norm or, rather, that level of development that best represented the entire group, and then the upper and lower extremes of variation from the norm. Once the essential data was analyzed, however, this proved an unrealistic goal. With the exception of two NCEY graduates at the upper extreme who have risen to supervisory positions and two at the lowest extreme, who are now once more unemployed and on welfare, all of the NCEY graduates appear to stand on roughly equal points along a career line: They have gone somewhat past each agency's entry level in terms of wages, titles or responsibilities, but they are unlikely to have moved beyond to any new status with their present employer or with another human service agency.

The area of greatest apparent variation is in wages. But upon close scrutiny it is clear that current variations in wage levels are probably more a reflection of salary scale variations between agencies then differences in paraprofessional achievement or output. As evidence, it was found that paraprofessionals in any one agency were generally paid equal wages, not withstanding substantial differences in job functions and widely varying reports on the quality of performance given by supervisors.

The search for differences within the sample tested the gamut of factors to see whether age, education, prior experience and specific tasks, training differentials among agencies, supervisory ratings of skill increases and job performance, trainee attitudes towards the job or the desire to return to school, appeared to affect work levels and salaries achieved. No significant correlations emerged. The few who appeared to differ substantially from the norm were too small a sub-sample for valid comparison.

For example, no correlation was found to exist between those with higher levels of education and those earning at higher levels:

> The NCEY graduate ranking first in salary and title had attended college.
>
> The NCEY graduate ranking second in salary and title had not completed high school.
>
> NCEY graduates who had attended college ranked in the middle and low middle salary range, while high school graduates and non-high school graduates were scattered randomly throughout the levels of the entire salary range.

This reconfirmed the finding that salary differentials were attributable more to agency or group bargaining power on wage scales than to individual qualifications, at least for paraprofessionals. The wage link to education appears to relate only to those with a minimum of a baccalaureate degree.

However, there were differences in individual assessments by the NCEY graduates of both the possibility and desirability of pursuing higher education degrees. An attempt to correlate these views with prior education experiences revealed that those most eager to continue their education included the oldest member of the group, 55 years old, as well as the youngest. In terms of educational experience, they included two of the five who had completed some college work prior to NCEY's training and two who had not completed high school. Neither age nor prior schooling appear to be a determinent. Nor does earnings, family status or the job at hand. Nor did the performance level, since a number of individuals rated as superior by their supervisors and capable of college work were not planning to enroll.*

Only in the review of data relating to the assessments by graduates of their own work experiences and their future prospects in the human services field was enough variation encountered to suggest the possibility of a tripartite division of the sample. The striking similarities already noted in the actual experience of the group were not entirely reflected in these perceptions. Their assessments of post-training experience could be classified into three groups:

---

* For half, the impetus may have been the employer's willingness to offer tuition payments and released time.

Positive-- those who felt they had and would continue to have considerable opportunity.

Neutral--those who are satisfied with their work experience to date, but uncertain of the future.

Negative--those who consider their experience to have been of little value.

The neutral group was further refined by the introduction of two sub-groups: the neutral/positive groups--those uncertain of the future who are well adjusted to current jobs and strongly motivated towards self-development; and the neutral/negative group who seemed somewhat ill-suited to the work and lacked interest in further education or training opportunities.

The breakdown of the NCEY graduates according to these classifications were as follows:

Positive Group:	5 graduates
Neutral/Positive Group:	5 graduates
Neutral Group:	9 graduates
Neutral/Negative Group:	3 graduates
Negative Group:	4 graduates
TOTAL:	26 graduates

Across these divisions and sub-divisions remarkable similarities appeared for the total group in job functions, performance levels, distribution by age, education, etc. Even the relationship between salary and satisfactory career experience was far from a perfect correlation. For example, in the positive groups, three are earning over $ 8,000 a year, while two are close to $6,000. In the negative group one is earning over $ 8,000 and three are earning under $6,000.

The question to be pursued was what caused these differences? The answer might be found to lie in the employee's personality, attitudes, proclivities, goals, values or some other intangibles.

On the other hand, it might stem from interpersonal relationships, the rapport (or lack of it) between the worker and his immediate supervisor and other co-workers. The findings to this question will be reported in the section on supervision because a substantial degree of correlation was found between the positive, neutral or negative attitudes, and the degrees of satisfaction of the NCEY graduates with their supervisory relationships.

Overall, however, it should be noted that assessments by paraprofessionals of their own opportunities for advancement in the agencies that employ them were highly realistic. Because of the improvement in their employment status since their NCEY days, because of the satisfactions derived on their jobs, because of the increases in their earnings, and/or because there were few better opportunities for employment elsewhere, most of the NCEY graduates appeared content to stay where they were. But they also appeared bound by all of the current limitations. There were increasing reports of dissatisfaction about restrictions upon advancement. To the NCEY graduates, as well as to other experienced paraprofessionals, the dual system of opportunities based on academic credentials alone is an unfair system that artificially forecloses them from jobs with which they are familiar and which they feel confident they could perform satisfactorily. The majority of agency executives and supervisors interviewed made similar assessments.

CHAPTER V

ON THE JOB: THE TASKS PERFORMED

To bring into focus the exact nature of the paraprofessional jobs held by those in the sample, each NCEY graduate and his supervisor was given a prepared checklist and was asked to identify the specific tasks performed and to add the tasks not listed. They were also asked to indicate the frequency of performing these tasks on a scale from high to low. These responses made it possible to approximate a functional task analysis for all of the 26 trainees in all of the agencies. Since one graduate worked in two agencies, information was obtained for 27 paraprofessional jobs.

For purposes of analysis the tasks are clustered into five major categories:

Group I:	Outreach
Group II:	Intake, information and communication (verbal)
Group III:	Information and communication (written)
Group IV:	Administration, organization and supervision
Group V:	Testing and teaching

Table E on page 5-3 provides a comparative analysis of the tasks performed by the entire group, illustrating characteristics of individual jobs and agency roles for paraprofessionals. The M symbol indicates that the task is performed most frequently. The L symbol indicates that the task is performed less frequently.

As this analysis shows, the majority of NCEY graduates hold highly generalized jobs that require the regular performance of a large number of tasks. The breakdown is as follows:

"Most frequently"--

Three of the paraprofessional jobs require the performance "most frequently" of between nine and eleven tasks.

Eight require between seven and eight tasks.

Ten require between four and six tasks.

Six require three or less tasks.

"Less frequently" but still on a regular basis--

Fourteen of the paraprofessional jobs require the performance of between fourteen and twenty tasks.

Eight require between eight and eleven tasks.

Five require seven or less tasks.

Even more significantly, the data revealed that many of the NCEY graduates often perform the same tasks in different agencies. Most frequently these tasks are of a generalist (rather than specialist) nature and entail contacts with the clients and the linking of clients, agency and community. A minority of the jobs included tasks of a more traditionally specialist nature--such as counseling, screening, testing and teaching--tasks that are more likely to be performed by professionals or that involve supervision and administration. Table E on the following page provides the precise breakdown. Table F presents the same data broken down by tasks performed by 50% or more and those by less than half of the graduates.

TASKS PERFORMED IN PARAPROFESSIONAL JOBS

AGENCIES AND NCEY GRADUATES

TASKS	A		B								C			D		E		F			G				H			TOTALS	
	1	2*	1	2*	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	M	L
Group 1: Outreach																													
Recruiting	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	L	L	-	-	-	-	L	L	L	L	-	-	L	1	9
Making home visits	-	M	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	L	M	L	L	L	-	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	6	11
Follow up in community	L	M	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	M	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	-	L	M	L	L	M	L	M	M	6	13
Follow up by phone	L	M	L	-	-	L	-	L	-	-	L	-	-	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	M	M	L	4	16
Accomp. clients to agencies	-	L	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	-	L	L	L	-	M	L	M	L	M	-	M	-	M	5	8
Contacting other agencies	L	L	-	-	-	M	-	L	-	-	L	-	-	L	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	L	M	12	7
Contacting employers	L	L	-	-	-	M	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	M	-	L	M	M	M	M	L	L	M	7	7
Group II: Intake, information and communication (oral)																													
Interviewing	L	L	M	-	L	M	M	L	M	-	L	L	L	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	-	13	11
Providing information	M	M	L	M	M	M	-	M	L	-	M	L	M	M	L	L	M	M	L	L	M	M	M	M	L	M	-	16	8
Providing advice	M	M	-	L	M	M	-	M	-	-	M	L	M	M	M	L	M	M	L	L	M	L	M	M	-	-	-	14	6
Providing materials	L	M	M	M	M	L	L	L	M	M	L	L	L	L	M	M	-	L	-	-	M	M	M	M	-	L	-	12	10
Counseling	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Screening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	M	M	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	3	2
Group III: Information and communication (written)																													
Writing reports	M	L	L	L	M	M	M	M	L	M	M	L	L	L	M	M	L	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	19	8
Keeping records	-	L	-	L	L	L	L	L	M	L	L	M	-	-	L	L	-	L	-	L	M	L	L	L	-	L	L	3	17
Correspondence	L	L	-	-	-	M	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	M	L	M	M	L	L	L	M	L	L	L	-	L	-	5	11
Clerical	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	L	-	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	L	L	L	L	L	L	-	L	1	11
Group IV: Organization, supervision and administration																													
Organizing activities	M	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	L	-	M	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	3
Organizing meetings	M	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	L	-	M	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5
Supervising	M	L	-	L	-	-	-	M	-	-	L	-	-	M	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
Training other workers	M	L	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
Making Job assignments	M	L	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	L	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
Administrating	M	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
Group V: Teaching & Testing																													
Testing	-	-	-	L	M	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	L	-	-	-	-	-	2	3
Teaching	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	M	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-

M= Most frequently
L= Less frequently

*= one graduate employed by 2 agencies

TABLE F - BREAKDOWN OF TASKS PERFORMED

TASKS REPORTED BY OVER 50% OF NCEY GRADUATES

TASKS	Out of a Total of 8 Agencies	Out of a Total of 27 Jobs
GROUP I: Outreach		
Follow up: phone	8	20
Follow up: community	8	19
Contacting agencies	8	19
Home visits	8	17
Contacting employers	6	14
Accomp. clients to agencies	8	13
GROUP II: Intake, Information and Communication (oral)		
Interviewing	8	24
Providing information	8	24
Providing materials	8	22
Providing advice	7	20
GROUP III: Information and Communication (written)		
Writing reports	8	27
Keeping records	8	20
Correspondence	7	16

TASKS REPORTED BY LESS THAN 50% OF NCEY GRADUATES

TASKS	Out of a Total of 8 Agencies	Out of a Total of 27 Jobs
GROUP I: Outreach		
Recruiting	6	10
GROUP II: Intake, Information and Communication (oral)		
Counseling	1	2
Screening	3	5
GROUP III: Information and Communication (written)		
Clerical	5	12
GROUP IV: Managerial		
Organizing activities	5	8
Organizing meetings	4	6
Supervising	4	8
Training other workers	4	5
Making job assignments	4	5
Administration	3	4
GROUP VI: Testing and Teaching		
Testing	3	5
Teaching	1	2

Not withstanding the basic similarity of paraprofessional functions, a wide assortment of job titles are used by agencies to designate the jobs held by NCEY graduates. For example, the following ten titles are held by graduates reporting similar job functions in different agencies:

Administrative Assistant
Area Coordinator
Community Organizer
Community Worker
Family Assistant
Human Resources Technician
Intake Counselor
Sr. Community Mental Health Worker
Social Worker
Social Work Assistant

AGENCY FUNCTIONS AND PARAPROFESSIONAL TASKS

Out of the eight agencies studied, only two (Agency A & C) provide multiple services; the other six are specialized. Nevertheless the similarity of paraprofessional job functions in all agencies was found to override the diverse service objectives and render meaningless and confusing the differences in job titles . A common need was reported by agencies for paraprofessionals and staff to establish communications with the population served by the agencies; to interpret, disseminate, and retrieve information; and to generally assist the clients in relating to and securing needed services.

Most of the agencies reported a broadening of their services to deal more comprehensively with the needs of clients, particularly by providing more precise referral and active follow up, and by placing increasing emphasis on comprehensive intake, communication, outreach and follow up with clients. It is in these areas of expanding agency activity that paraprofessionals have been utilized most frequently by all agencies.

All agencies reported efforts to move in the direction of greater involvement with and greater service to the low-income community. The agencies' reports, verified by task analysis, indicate that paraprofessionals as staff drawn from the same group of clients are used to establish communication and transmit information between client and agency, particularly in the initial stages of involvement.

HOW AGENCIES ASSESS THE PERFORMANCE OF PARAPROFESSIONALS

Agency executives and supervisors gave high ratings to the performance of paraprofessionals in outreach, verbal communication and information tasks. They gave particularly high ratings to the ability of paraprofessionals to establish relationships and rapport with the client population and to gain client acceptance for the agency's service.

All agencies use paraprofessionals to serve low-income clients from minority groups who live in ghetto areas.

The following comments represent the general views of agencies in the sample, not merely those of each commentator:

"In intake interviewing, paraprofessionals are very good at picking up clues and cues from the clients. They have a good ear for false leads and 'put-ons'. Their maturity and accumulated life experience, combined with first-hand knowledge of the client population, assists the agency in establishing communication with clients rapidly. The purpose of intake is to attach and involve the client with the agency. When paraprofessionals perform this function, it cuts down on the need for outreach services. To perform as well in this regard, young college graduates need a great deal more experience as well as special training. When rapport and involvement with the

*agency is not sufficiently established through the professionals, then the paraprofessionals must be used as outreach workers to establish the relationship, involve the client, and keep bringing him back. The new client is more comfortable with a paraprofessional because he or she is someone like himself."**

Another agency executive observed:

"Clients may come in with suspicion based on experience with the white world in the ghetto, where they were dependent on this world for services. Now when they come to the agency, they see people like themselves in a different role, where they are not in a provider/beneficiary relationship, but are in a colleague/partner relationship, providing services to the ghetto or the community and to people like themselves. This serves to increase confidence in the agency."

An NCEY graduate is described to underscore the need for black staff members:

"He is an excellent role model for the people he works with, the role model of a black man. Angry, tough, black street kids identify very well with him and he draws and involves them very effectively and very contructively. He has about six different vocabularies that he can use in relation to the individual or group he is dealing with, that is from professional talk to street talk to kids talk. He has the ability not to get hung-up with the black/white issue and to deliver a 'pure message from the agency'."

---

* This comment was made by an executive in Agency H, where civil service prohibitions prevent paraprofessionals from interviewing within the agency. It is a function out of limits for their title or job classification.

HOW PARAPROFESSIONALS EVALUATE THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE

Paraprofessional performance in outreach and verbal communication and in information tasks is rated highly not only by agencies. It is similarly assessed by the paraprofessionals themselves. From Table G on the following page, it can be seen that paraprofessionals assess their performance in outreach tasks in Group I as more than adequate or adequate in almost all instances. They make an even higher assessment of their ability to perform the tasks in Group II, which includes intake, oral information and communication. For tasks in Group III, written information and communication, the assessment ranges from adequate to less than adequate in almost all instances. In the area of written reports, the group is most critical of its own performance. They rate themselves as adequate in Group IV (organizing, supervising, training and administering), and spread their evaluation equally among all three ratings in Group V (testing and teaching).

Most agency personnel indicated that college credentials were desirable more to provide eligibility for higher level jobs within the agency than to improve performance on most tasks. The exception noted was the area of written reports. A number noted that college training would provide a great deal of experience in the preparation of research papers and other reports, and helps to improve paraprofessionals in written communication skills.

TABLE G

PARAPROFESSIONAL SELF-EVALUATION OF TASK PERFORMANCE

TASKS	More than adequate	Adequate	Less than adequate
Group I			
1. Recruiting	1	7	2
2. Making home visits	10	6	-
3. Follow up in community	7	11	1
4. Follow up by phone	4	13	2
5. Accompanying clients to agencies	6	7	-
6. Contacting other agencies	11	6	1
7. Contacting employers	4	9	1
Group II			
8. Interviewing	10	14	-
9. Providing information	11	13	-
10. Providing advice	9	11	-
11. Providing materials	8	11	-
12. Counseling	1	-	1
13. Screening	-	4	-
Group III			
14. Writing reports	3	13	11
15. Keeping records	3	12	5
16. Correspondence	2	12	2
17. Clerical	-	5	6
Group IV			
18. Organizing activities	3	3	-
19. Organizing meetings	3	3	-
20. Supervising	-	4	1
21. Training other workers	-	3	-
22. Making job assignments	-	3	-
23. Administrating	-	4	-
Group V			
24. Testing	2	-	2
25. Teaching	-	2	-

PARAPROFESSIONALS VS. YOUNG PROFESSIONALS

In a number of agencies, young college graduates in their entry level jobs perform many of the same generalist functions as paraprofessionals, although they make more money and are designated as professionals. A number of agency executives and supervisors compared the assets of the new young professional college graduates with the generally more mature paraprofessionals.

Most of these agencies reported that paraprofessionals bring to the job superior knowledge of the community, ability in relating to minority group members, and actual life experience-based knowledge of the needs and problems encountered by individuals seeking service from the agency. They also noted that young professionals lack this knowledge. On the job, the professionals are just beginning to acquire skills in dealing with members of minority groups and in understanding the nature of the problems encountered in ghetto communities and the resources available to meet these needs.

The examination of the generalist function, in terms of whether it should be designated as paraprofessional or professional was not a focus of this study. However, there were recurrent indications that similarity in functions between paraprofessionals and young professionals, coupled with wide disparities in salary for equal work, were creating dissatisfaction among paraprofessionals.

Requirements based on academic training, it was found, provide the individual with broadly based knowledge, experience in learning diverse subject matter and developed skills in both retrieving and disseminating information. Thus, agencies operate on the premise that the college graduate who lacks experience in the problems of poverty has the ability to acquire it on the job.

One observer noted:

"Paraprofessionals come into the human service agency with community-based, experience-based knowledge, whereas, the new professional comes in with educationally based knowledge. In order to effectively deliver services, the paraprofessional needs to expand his theoretical education base and the new professional needs to expand his experience base. Deliberate efforts should be made to provide training for each in the area of deficit . Until the human service worker has the combination of academic knowledge and experience-based knowledge, he cannot really develop appropriately to a truly professional level. Therefore, both the paraprofessional and the new professional who is a college graduate, are both on rungs of the career ladder below that of a full fledged professional. Each should be enabled to pursue an alternative approach towards achieving the professional level, as I have just defined it."

A number of executives reported recommending to their agencies a reconsideration of qualifications and requirements for the generalist role. They took the view that a combination of experience and learning is needed for higher level jobs, but that either qualification would be acceptable for the entry level.

One agency executive reported a very interesting experience:

"We provide orientation to young college graduates employed as executive trainees. We give them a range of experience in different job functions within the agency. Some of these overlap with those of the paraprofessionals. So we thought it would be beneficial to include both groups in some joint training. The professionals had

taken a rather rigorous test prior to employment, and were a bright group. The experiment wasn't too successful. We found that the college trainees learned faster than the paraprofessionals, and in the learning situation paraprofessionals were at a disadvantage. However, when it came to application of learning a job function, we found that the paraprofessionals applied the knowledge more effectively, performed better and applied themselves more diligently. This is difficult to explain. Perhaps for the paraprofessionals, their jobs represent a measure of achievement and accomplishment. They certainly are highly motivated to perform well. The same functions for young college trainees represent lowest level jobs within their potential career span, jobs they're eager to be done with so they can move on to roles they consider more important. Perhaps their problem is that we give them training to be executives and then make them wait an awfully long time before they get a chance to be one."

A number of agencies reported a high turnover in young professional staff and questioned the suitability of entry level professional jobs to bright, well-educated, committed young college graduates.

Several agencies noted that their salary levels in the lower range of professional jobs were not competitive with those in newer programs. Staff not concerned about the long-run tended to move on when better-paying opportunities to serve society became available, thus handicapping these agencies from developing supervisors from the ranks of young professionals. Mature, stable staff, such as the paraprofessionals cannot be developed for promotion because they are not eligible for promotion under existing educational criteria.

CHAPTER VI

TRAINING, EDUCATION AND CAREER MOBILITY

Where did the NCEY graduates learn to perform the diverse tasks their jobs entailed? The tasks listed by graduates as those they "most frequently" performed were for the most part learned during the NCEY training program. In addition some training was provided in these same tasks by many of the agencies. Table H on the following page illustrates this finding.

As the table indicates, the NCEY training proved relevant for a high proportion of the sample. This is not surprising since NCEY's objective had been to prepare paraprofessionals for human relations work in the broadest sense. It was essentially generic training in skills that could be used in all human service agencies, regardless of the specialized service. It was training particularly designed as preparation for work requiring direct interaction with people.

Once employed, most paraprofessionals reported that they received some form of job orientation, and that supervisors were available on request to assist in the performance of tasks. However, in some instances, turnover among supervisors was greater than that among paraprofessionals and so the latter had to provide orientation to the former.

TABLE H

WHERE TASKS WERE LEARNED

TASKS	Number Reporting	Trained by NCEY	Trained by Agency	Trained by Other
Group I				
1. Recruiting	10	3	7	-
2. Making home visits	17	15	6	1
3. Following up in community	19	14	11	2
4. Following up by phone	20	17	5	-
5. Accomp. clients to agencies	13	10	8	2
6. Contacting other agencies	19	16	4	1
7. Contacting employers	14	11	6	1
Group II				
8. Interviewing	24	24	3	3
9. Providing information	24	12	21	3
10. Providing advice	20	4	20	1
11. Providing materials	22	4	18	3
12. Counseling	2	-	1	1
13. Screening	5	-	5	-
Group III				
14. Writing reports	27	24	14	2
15. Keeping records	20	8	14	2
16. Correspondence	16	8	9	1
17. Clerical	12	11	8	1
Group IV				
18. Organizing activities	8	1	5	2
19. Organizing meetings	8	1	5	3
20. Supervising	5	-	4	1
21. Training other workers	5	-	3	2
22. Making job assignments	5	-	3	2
23. Administrating	4	-	4	-
Group V				
24. Testing	5	-	5	-
25 Teaching	2	-	2	-

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Beyond the initial period of job orientation, no common training practices were reported by all agencies. Generally, there was an absence of continuing in-service training. According to the view of some agency staff members, paraprofessionals already had sufficient skills and knowledge to perform current job assignments without further training. Only one agency, Agency A, has a program of continuing in-service training.

In view of our findings about obstacles to career mobility, the lack of agency training was not surprising. When agencies provide only limited opportunities for advancement, there is little motivation for continuing in-service training. This was emphasized by one supervisor:

"We are in the position to provide more training to paraprofessionals to increase their skills. We are not, however, in the position to increase their salaries or to promote them when they acquire more skills. Under these circumstances, it is unreasonable to ask paraprofessionals to participate in additional training."

In another agency where there are some opportunities for greater mobility and yet no continuing training, an agency executive made a critical observation:

"The shortage or absence of training on a continuing basis is one of the major weaknesses of the program. We provide no phased training so that the paraprofessionals in one job slot might concurrently be receiving training for the next level. The result favors those with the capacity to learn on their own, Those who have the potential for promotion are not provided with opportunities

for learning so that they develop to the next level.

In this agency, the absence of training is one of the major weaknesses of the program in terms of career mobility opportunities. The agency has given the poor people jobs, but it has not provided them with the necessary training. The fact that paraprofessionals have stayed with the agency for a great many years is not to me a sign of stability, but rather a sign of the fact that opportunities available within the agency without necessary formal training are not available in the outside world. In my view, in order to provide true career mobility opportunities, the agency would have had to provide paraprofessionals in one job slot with training for the next levels. Such opportunities for people to learn would develop them for the next level, either within this agency or with another agency."

SUPPLEMENTARY TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Training outside the agency in particular skills without college credits was provided to paraprofessionals in only two agencies (Agencies A & D). One NCEY graduate participated in a federally-funded, eight-week training session for employees of agencies operating a specific program; another received management training outside the agency for one week, when he moved into a supervisory position. As detailed in the next chapter, supplementary education for academic credits is provided to paraprofessionals in only two of the agencies, Agencies D and E. In both cases, the education leads towards an associate degree. At present, both employees at Agency E are enrolled. Employees at Agency D are awaiting available openings.

Table I below summarizes employer agency reports on training provided to paraprofessionals.

TABLE I

TYPES OF TRAINING PROVIDED BY EIGHT AGENCIES

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Job orientation (in-service)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Continuing in-service	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Supplementary training (non-credit)	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	-
Supplementary education (academic credit)	-	-	-	X	X	-	-	-

X=provided

EDUCATION AND CAREER MOBILITY

At the time of their entry into the NCEY training program, 35% of the group had not completed high school, 46% were high school graduates, and 19% had some college education. At the time of the study, four years later, the educational achievement of the group had changed as follows:

TABLE J

EDUCATION PROFILE OF STUDY SAMPLE

	Pre-NCEY	Post-NCEY Fall, 1969
SOME COLLEGE	5	9
HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	12	9
LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE	9	8
TOTAL TRAINEES	26	26

One-third of the NCEY graduates are currently enrolled in part-time higher education programs or are scheduled to enroll in the Fall. They are operating on the principle that the road is continuing job mobility is paved with education credits.

This general principle is confirmed by the fact that in all but one agency in the sample, the baccalaureate degree was found to be the entry requirement for open-ended opportunity. At the same time, a number of the agencies also required advanced degrees for the highest level jobs.

As mentioned in Chapter IV, no correlation was found between the previous educational achievement of the NCEY graduates and their post-training advancement. Educational differences, ranging from the tenth grade to the third year of college, were not reflected in job promotions nor in salary differences. This finding may be attributable to the fact that agency hiring practices make no distinction between the qualifications of individuals holding less than a bachelor's degree.

In the light of this finding, a closer look was taken at the job structures and promotion practices of the two agencies (Agencies D and E) providing paraprofessionals with opportunities to study at universities towards a two-year associate arts degree. The agencies provided released time and tuition was paid for. Two NCEY graduates from the one agency are currently enrolled and two from the other agency are on a waiting list (one is accepted for September).

The associated degree program in Agency D was specially designed for paraprofessionals in this agency. There are two courses of study, one leading to a specialization in early childhood education and one leading to a specialization in social work. The NCEY graduates will be working in the social work specialization.

The university used the faculty of the graduate school of social work to design this paraprofessional course. The university also worked closely with the agency in the design since the objective was relevant to the job and the provision of skills, knowledge and understanding to perform at a higher level. It is significant that there are no undergraduate courses of study in the field of social work, so that the paraprofessionals enrolled in this program will be provided with more specialized training in the field at the end of two years than a four-year liberal arts graduate would hope to acquire.

Yet neither Agency D nor Agency E, which is also sponsoring study for an associate arts degree, had modified its job structure to open eligibility to existing higher level jobs, or to develop new jobs for holders of associate arts degrees. Furthermore, neither agency had modified its salary scale to increase pay for paraprofessionals holding the associate arts degree.

The explanation was found to lie in the genesis of each agency's participation in the associate arts degree program: For Agency D, participation was enabled by its federal funding source, which contracted with universities throughout the country to establish higher education programs for paraprofessionals employed by agencies sponsoring its program. These agencies were expected to comply with a recent federal guideline that mandated the establishment of career ladders for all jobs within this agency, from the entry level to the highest level, and the formulation of career plans for each employee. Agencies reported that they encountered tremendous difficulty in complying with this mandate. One large handicap was the unavailability of additional funds to cover salary increases for holders of the associate degree or the establishment of higher paying positions for degree holders. Other issues were such questions as the validity of limiting eligibility for higher level positions to holders of associate arts degree, inasmuch as some paraprofessionals currently deserve promotions. It was reported that technical assistance will be provided shortly to the agency by its federal funding source to help work out these complex problems. In the meantime, however, motivation for those enrolled in the program is being undermined by the absence of visible rewards to compensate for the hardships imposed by a full work load, college work and family responsibilities.

The other agency (Agency E) involved in the associate arts degree program came to it as a result of pressures from the paraprofessionals in the agency. As part of their union negotiations they demanded higher education opportunities. The agency acceded to the request and made arrangements with a university for the paraprofessional staff to enroll. It provided released time and paid tuition. However, like the other agencies, it did not deal with the question of what additional opportunities or what salary benefits would be made available to holders of the associate arts degree. None of the agency's three job levels for paraprofessionals currently has an educational requirement. It is doubtful if the imposition of such requirements at this late date would be acceptable to the paraprofessionals.

CHAPTER VII

SUPERVISION AND CAREER MOBILITY

Supervision cannot be termed a principal factor in either enabling or obstructing career mobility within the agencies employing NCEY graduates at the present time. The principal factor is agency structure. So long as supervisors are not able to modify agency structures, they are in this sense, irrelevant to the issue of mobility.

A number of supervisors reported dissatisfaction with the limitation upon opportunities for paraprofessionals within their agencies. A number sought changes in agency practices that would make further advancement possible. However, these supervisors indicated that they had not been able to have any impact on changing agency structures, nor on increasing the opportunities available to paraprofessionals without college degrees nor on establishing a system of credit for experience in paraprofessional jobs that could be applied towards eligibility for higher level jobs. They cited the usual obstacle of the baccalaureate degree as the principle stumbling block.

Nevertheless, while supervisors have not had an impact on actual mobility where opportunities are lacking, the majority of respondents indicated that they have had an important impact on the attitudes of paraprofessionals toward present or future opportunities for advancement.

On the basis of differences in perceptions regarding present or future mobility, the NCEY graduates were classified according to positive, neutral or negative attitudes. Efforts were made to find correlations between these attitudinal classifications and such factors as opportunities provided by agencies, salaries, age, education and the ability to perform satisfactorily on the job. None of these worked out. The only significant correlation was between attitudes towards career opportunities and towards supervisors.

When the relationship between paraprofessional and supervisor was satisfactory, the NCEY graduate displayed a positive attitude towards opportunities in the future. When NCEY graduates assessed their present and future opportunities negatively, they also indicated their relationships with their supervisors were negative.

Within the neutral range, which had been subdivided into neutral/positive, neutral and neutral/negative groupings, it was found that the neutral/positive assessments were made in agencies where mobility was actually very limited but where supervisory relationships were sufficiently positive to compensate, at least in part, for the lack of opportunity. Those NCEY graduates whose attitudes fell in the neutral/negative range indicated that relationships with supervisors were either extremely nominal or negative.

Normally, in career development a lot depends on the caliber of supervision. The supervisor generally provides most of the informal training on the job. Further, the supervisor can influence attitudes towards the agency work and can serve as a role model for higher job levels. Through a supervisor's personal interest, staff members can develop awareness of opportunities and the confidence to pursue them.

A number of specific deviations from this typical relationship between staff and supervisors should be borne in mind in respect to paraprofessionals and their supervisors and subsequent career development.

1- A supervisor who has never worked in the paraprofessional role cannot demonstrate how to do the job. He lacks the expertise gained through experience that foremen in industry generally have.

2- A supervisor cannot serve as a role model on how to get ahead if he has not come up through the ranks, but instead has moved ahead through eligibility based on academic credentials.

3- A supervisor cannot motivate staff to aspire to higher level jobs when none are available to paraprofessionals.

4- Younger supervisors cannot serve as role models for mature paraprofessionals when there are vast differences in advantages, in backgrounds, race and educational credentials. Paraprofessionals are not apt to bring problems to individual supervisors who cannot be expected to empathize because their experience was dissimilar.

Bearing these factors in mind, an effort was made to delineate differences among supervisors so as to ascertain the basis for variations in attitudes among paraprofessionals. Since this is a period of transition in human service agencies, supervisors were placed on a continuum from the old to the new, in terms of the degree of their adaptation to change reflected in their attitudes, manner and style of operating.

Most of the supervisors fell in the middle range and demonstrated that they temselves were trying to transform the nature and style of the supervisory role in response to new needs. Some fell at the extremes of the old and the new. It was in these extremes that a decided correlation was found between supervision and the positive or negative attitudes exhibited by the NCEY graduates.

It is a new type of supervisor who has evoked the most positive responses from paraprofessionals. He functions as a team leader and as a supervisor-developer-trainer of his staff.

THE NEW SUPERVISOR'S MODEL

His objectives are staff development and team integration for better service delivery. He uses work experience as training opportunities that will enable staff members to perform better, both as a team and as individuals. He believes the experience will prepare them for whatever higher level jobs open up within the department or elsewhere.

Such supervisors expressed delight with the NCEY graduates and praised their capacity to learn new tasks and to perform at a high level. The typical personality style of these supervisors was found to be open and enthusiastic --qualities paralleling those of many of the paraprofessionals themselves. These supervisors appeared to relate to paraprofessionals in much the same way as the paraprofessionals relate to the community: that is on a highly human level, with an ability to communicate well, to understand and to empathize. The great frustrations expressed by these supervisors were the lack of opportunity for salary and position increases for the paraprofessionals on their staff.

THE OLD SUPERVISOR'S MODEL

A few supervisors fell at the lower end of the spectrum, representing the traditional way of doing things in the same manner as in the past. They indicated dissatisfaction with so many changes in the agency and in the city. They displayed discomfort and a lack of familiarity with direct interactive relationships with minority groups and members of the client community. They indicated preferences for the older mode of relationship of superior and subordinate, and appeared also to lack the experience and the skills needed for direct relationships with staff on a team basis.

Their careers developed under the older hierarchical system, with emphasis on knowledge of rules and procedures. They moved through the systems over the years, finding now that they are in supervisory positions, that the system has changed, that many old rules no longer operate and that new staffs under their supervision (young college graduates and paraprofessionals) do not know the old rules and do not function according to them. These supervisors evaluated the NCEY graduates on their staff principally in terms of their adherence to time schedules, the orderliness of their written work and the promptness of their report submissions. Most described the role of supervisors as that of a person who is held accountable by his superior for the accountability of his staff.

One supervisor complained that an NCEY graduate who was rebuked for lateness retorted, "You're late as often as I am." The supervisor replied, "That is not your concern, it's my supervisor's." This supervisor criticized this attitude as lacking in deference and respect, and suspects it is indicative of hostility, racial hostility. The interview with the paraprofessional referred to indicated that he viewed this supervisor as negatively as the supervisor viewed him. He said, "I do my job very well, he has no complaints," and the supervisor indeed did not report any with work performance. On a human level, both interviews indicated that no relationship had been established and no communication took place. Disregard was mutual.

These comments about old and new supervisors have not been made to pinpoint good guys and bad guys, but rather to report differences in supervisory styles. The newer approach appears to be a more appropriate response to emerging needs on the part of both staff and client. Among the NCEY graduates, the new style supervisor evoked more positive responses; the old tended to generate negative attitudes.

An effort was made to tally NCEY graduates'assessments of how supervisors were most helpful and least helpful, were most demanding and least demanding. The responses contained no specific concrete examples of either help or demands. References were made to attitudes of supportiveness and responsiveness toward paraprofessionals displayed by supervisors.

The most helpful citations about supervisors were expressed about the continued willingness and availability of supervisors in response to requests for help generally. The second most frequent response was for giving the paraprofessional confidence in his own capabilities (none of the respondents cited ways in which their supervisors were "least helpful").

Responses on how supervisors are most demanding were very few. The majority reported that supervisors make no demands. A few complained about the lack of demands as indicative of a lack of interest. Only five NCEY graduates reported that their supervisors made any demands upon them. The examples cited referred to punctuality, neatness in the workroom, meeting deadlines, and calling in when working off the office premises.

SUPERVISORY PATTERNS AND PRACTICES REPORTED BY NCEY GRADUATES.

In the data gathering phase a great deal of information was obtained from the NCEY graduates about their relationships with supervisors. Remarkable similarity was reported in supervisory patterns between agencies, despite stylistic differences among individual supervisors, On the basis of interviews with all NCEY graduates, a general pattern emerged:

The typical NCEY graduate works in the same office or department as his supervisor and sees him daily. However, he does not receive daily work assignments nor does he need to report to his supervisor daily. It is more likely that work assignments are given on a weekly,bi-weekly or as-needed basis, with the paraprofessional himself substantially planning his own schedule. The supervisor is available for assistance in any area on an as-needed basis. The typical graduate found that this was a sufficient amount of supervision to enable him to do the job. In fact, he reports that he feels able to function on the job without supervision. His supervisor demonstrates his belief in the paraprofessionals' ability to do the job, through indication of trust. He does not keep a watchful eye on his day-to-day activities. The typical supervisor also indicates satisfaction with the work being performed. He generally assists the paraprofessional in his quest for promotion or salary increases allowable within the agency structure. He also shows his respect for the paraprofessional by treating him the same as he does everyone else in the department, including professionals.

Paraprofessionals in human services were found to receive minimal on-going supervision past the initial period of employment.

Supervisors grant them a high degree of autonomy. According to a majority of NCEY graduates who have been on their jobs for a considerable period of time, the need for supervision was reported to decrease with the length of time on the job. The practice in these agencies is for the paraprofessional to work independently until he needs help and to initiate requests for assistance from this basis.

Supervisors' reports confirmed those of the trainees: they indicate that paraprofessionals required more on-going supervision in the initial stages of employment. As these employees became more familiar with their jobs, there was a diminishing of the need for continued direction.

The following table tallies the responses of paraprofessionals on the subject of supervision. While the significant findings have been extracted for comment in this section, the table provides a graphic illustration of the similarity of responses from 26 NCEY graduates in eight employer agencies.

TABLE K

PARAPROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS OF SUPERVISION IN EIGHT AGENCIES

AVAILABILITY & FREQUENCY	Number of trainees reporting
1. Supervisor in same office or department	25
2. Sees supervisor daily	20
3. Reports to supervisor daily	5
4. Receives assignments of work daily	None
5. Supervisor is available when sought out	20

STAFF TRAINING NEEDS FOR SUPERVISORS IN THE HUMAN SERVICES

All agencies reported that interpersonal relationships between supervisors and staff are in need of improvement. All agencies expressed the need for team training in human interrelationships between paraprofessionals, professionals and supervisors to increase their capacities, to understand themselves, each other and the clients they serve.

One executive noted, *"There is a need first to develop trainers in the human services to work with supervisory staff, to improve their managerial, training and other planning skills so that they can more optimally utilize the staff that they have and relate more effectively to other services in behalf of clients."*

In another agency, the research director noted, *"At the present time, almost no professional school provides training in supervision for the direction of other adults who have had the same or different training than the professionals. However, to an increasing extent, professionally trained individuals are being utilized in managerial or supervisory positions."*

In another agency, a training specialist underscored his viewpoint as follows:

"Professional supervisors have professional skills. Their professional specialization, however, has not provided them with training skills or supervisory skills for people who are not like themselves, that is, within the same professional discipline. A lot of work needs to be done with supervisors regarding the development of training skills. In a large organization, this can be done through in-service training for supervisors and middle-management training for professionals. Supervisors need training in both

work product supervision and interpersonal relationships. Supervisors need the latter to heighten their perception of themselves in relation to others and to expand the dimensions of their own experiences so that their world view includes the view of others unlike themselves. Specifically, this means that the professional middle-management, civil service oriented white professional needs to understand the life experiences of the ghetto, of the black community and of the paraprofessionals, and to understand their perception of the established world of the agency. Supervisors must be able to establish a meaningful relationship between the paraprofessional and the agency so that the latter can feel he is serving the interest of the community by working in the agency to a greater extent than he would by remaining in the community and fighting against it."

A university-based trainer of paraprofessionals commented on the scarcity of agency-provided in-service training to develop supervisory capacities among professional staff:

"There is a severe shortage of trainers of trainers of paraprofessional staff in the roles of manager, trainers and developers. There are also no funds designated for this purpose in the agency. At the same time programs in the human services are becoming more comprehensive and it becomes increasingly necessary for professional staff to function as team leaders, managers and developers so that the agency can deal more effectively with problems between the agency and the community and so that tensions and differences among staff and with clients can be more appropriately dealt with."

All of the agencies reported the need for efforts by the supervising personnel to integrate the paraprofessional and professional groups through team training, so that there could be better utilization of the skills and knowledge of each group by the other. While the executives in all agencies rated paraprofessionals highly for their skills in establishing communication with the client population and with disseminating and retrieving information, a number of the agency executives did not rate their own .professionals very highly for their ability to utilize the knowledge and understanding of paraprofessionals or to communicate as effectively with the client population.

One executive explained, " *I am trying to bring paraprofessionals and professionals in our agency into a much closer working relationship, because the young professionals have no knowledge of the ghetto community. Until they learn to relate effectively to the members of the community on their staff--the paraprofessionals--they cannot adequately do their job and cannot relate to the community effectively. From lack of experience many young professionals come into the agency with stereotyped views of the community. When you recruit young people just out of college, and give them a professional position and title, they resent any offer of assistance or any inference that they may not know it all, particularly from paraprofessionals. As a result, they feel threatened by this group who can reveal areas where their knowledge might not be so complete. This attitude tends to undermine the confidence of paraprofessionals who tend to be conscious of what they consider their own educational deficiencies and tend to be either impressed or overwhelmed by the verbal facility and complex speech patterns-well larded with the professional jargon of the professionals.*"

CHAPTER VIII

THE IMPACT OF CIVIL SERVICE, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND UNIONS

CIVIL SERVICE

Rigid civil service job classifications are often cited as a major cause of the lack of opportunities for career advancement among paraprofessionals. Without a doubt this is frequently the case, particularly in long-established institutions. Indeed the study found that the . two older agencies under civil service offered dim chances for career mobility to the NCEY graduates. What needs to be equally underlined, however, is that the agencies not under civil service, with no rigid classifications from above to adhere to, also set up obstacles to career advancement for paraprofessionals, obstacles remarkably similar to those under civil service, namely a college degree.

Three of the eight agencies (A,G and H) operate under civil service. One of these, Agency H, established a single level, noncompetitive classification for paraprofessionals that is not continuous with either the clerical line below or the professional line above. Paraprofessionals receive the benefits and security of civil service employment, but are precluded from opportunities to compete for higher level positions within the civil service merit system.

In the other two agencies, new civil service series are in the process of being established. Agency A is operating under a provisional series covering all classifications of personnel, from the entry aide level to that of principal or managing specialist. There are six levels in all to which all staff are eligible because the agency makes no distinction between paraprofessionals and professionals. Eligibility is based on experience and performance rather than educational credentials and thus paraprofessionals have unlimited opportunities to compete with other staff members for higher level positions under the merit system.

The third agency (G) also uses a provisional civil service series for its paraprofessionals, but this is not connected with the series covering its professional staff. Designed by another municipal agency to meet the needs of a large paraprofessional staff, the new series consists of several sequential job classifications to which paraprofessionals will be eligible on a competitive basis in the future. Agency G, however, is using only the entry level classification of the series although it acknowledges that its paraprofessionals are performing at a higher level. The problem, it says, is that no civil service examination has yet been developed for the higher levels and the agency cannot make permanent appointments until such an examination is taken and passed. In the meantime, paraprofessionals have remained in the provisional status they have held for more than three years, deprived of the benefits of tenure, security, etc.

As important as the need for civil service status in these and similar cases, it must be noted that to simply take on new jobs with no access to the professional civil service ladder is obviously not to create opportunities for great advancement. It may, of course, be a strategy to prove the competence of paraprofessionals by building in intervening steps while pushing for further changes. But then it should be recognized as that.

An effort was made to determine whether any of the agencies under study had taken steps to change the requirements for jobs or examine and redesign its jobs for paraprofessionals and professionals alike. Only Agency A, operating under its provisional civil service status, had done so. Another agency, which does not operate under civil service, was in the process of designing career ladders to expand paraprofessional opportunities, but it had not begun to deal with the large issue of the content and structuring of jobs within the agency. Although the need for job restructuring was recognized in a number of the other agencies, both under and not under civil service, it had not yet been seriously explored. As one agency executive commented, *"You might say the issue is ready to be placed on the agenda, but no one has yet brought it to the table for discussion."*

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

An obvious cause of the delay in job restructuring is the possible implications it could have for professionals. Although the standards of eligibility for mobility to professional levels in all but one agency is the requirement of a baccalaureate degree, little agreement was found in any of the agencies on the definition of the term professional nor on the qualifications of individuals already holding this designation within the agencies.

Professional designation was seldom found to mean what is generally implied: that an individual has been trained within a specific academic discipline to perform high level functions of a specialized nature within an established profession in which practices, standards and behavior are circumscribed or otherwise controlled by licensing, regulations or law.

Aside from the all-important bachelor's degree, there were as many differences as similarities among the agencies' requirements for professionals. Some agencies, for example, gave the title of social worker to holders of baccalaureate degrees, although the professional standards call for a Master of Social Work for holders of this title. In some agencies individuals designated as counselors are required to hold a master's degree, while others apply this designation provisionally to individuals who promise to pursue graduate study, generally with assistance from the agency.

And indeed there were many differences among agencies between those jobs considered professional and those paraprofessional. In the agencies where paraprofessionals were found to be performing gneeralist functions, professionals in supervisory or managerial roles were also performing generalist functions not covered by a specific established profession. A dramatic case in point of the great confusion that exists in job designation, design and qualifications was Agency F where Social Work Assistants designated as paraprofessionals and Social Work Associates designated as professionals were found to be performing the identical functions.

And yet only one agency responded to the inappropriateness of the existing situation by redesigning jobs and eliminating academic credentials from its higher-level requirements. The other agencies mainly criticized existing academic programs and the absence of academic programs preparing paraprofessionals for work in the human services. They commented on the need for relevant courses of study leading to the associate arts degree, the baccalaureate degree and the master's degree. But they continued to operate under "professional standards" which are in actuality academic standards, ambiguous ones at that, defined mainly by the years of schooling completed. Thus opportunities for able paraprofessionals were foreclosed. Interviewing, for example, a skill that can only be acquired within an agency, cannot be performed by paraprofessionals with extraordinary skills in this area in agencies that require a baccalaureate degree for this job.

UNIONS

The impact of labor unions in expanding or limiting career opportunities for paraprofessionals in the study was not greatly apparent. Union impact was evident, however, in the area of wage increases and benefits.

In one agency, the union was credited with playing a key role in establishing the second highest salary scale for paraprofessionals among the agencies studied. The union in this agency also assisted paraprofessionals in successfully advocating the reclassification of their jobs at higher levels to enable them to continue to receive annual wage increments.

In another agency, the union introduced into its contract negotiations the demand for educational benefits for paraprofessionals. As a result, paraprofessionals were provided with tuition-free opportunities to attend college and work towards an associate arts degree. They also receive released time with full pay.

In Agency F, where union activities have not yet resulted in improved opportunities for paraprofessionals, an NCEY graduate has been elected as delegate to the union for social service employees, paraprofessional and professional, of that institution. This indicates that paraprofessionals will be playing a greater role in union affairs and since this is the agency where there has already been a clash over professional and paraprofessional job designations and tasks, benefits should hopefully result.

In still another agency, paraprofessionals are not eligible for union membership because they are provisional employees. And here was found the lowest wage scale among all the agencies included in the study, with a top salary just slightly above $ 5,000, an amount that would not place it in a competitive position with any of the other employers of paraprofessionals.

Thus, for the most part, the findings revealed a beneficial impact of unions in raising wages and benefits. However any overall assessment must focus on the question of how high wages can be raised in the future without restructuring or reclassifying jobs. In addition, the ability of the union to help secure educational benefits such as tuition-free study for an associate arts degree can be rendered meaningless if the agencies job structures are not modified to provide a higher level position for holders of this title. At the moment, only bachelor's degrees are accepted.

How unions will respond to the call for job restructuring will depend on how well their interests are served. Conflicts are already evident. As one agency supervisor observed:

> *" The agency feels particularly pressured with the thrust from the community for greater hiring of members of minority groups and for greater participation of ghetto residents in human services. We are faced with a conflicting thrust from the union, which feels that its members' career security is threatened by the thrust from the community. They believe that increasing the role of paraprofessionals may lead to redefining tasks and functions and reclassifying jobs, which could threaten the job security of their members. This dilemma has great political implications. The matter will ultimately have to be handled in such a way as to not reproduce the polarization and problems created by a comparable situation in the school system, in which the interests of the community are opposed by the professional union. We are seeking to avoid such a confrontation."*

At the same time, however, as professional unions are becoming concerned, there is mounting union interest in representing large bodies of paraprofessionals, in the school system and the hospital system for example. Thus there are indications that unions will attempt to play a more prominent role in behalf of paraprofessionals in the future. In the period of time between the NCEY training program and this study, unions were found to have had minimal impact upon paraprofessional opportunities for continued advancement. The issue for the future is how they will use their potential influence for good or for bad.

CHAPTER IX

PARAPROFESSIONALS, AGENCIES & THE COMMUNITY

Few agencies provided opportunities for paraprofessionals to make their knowledge about the clients' problems and needs available to the agency as a whole. Thus, although paraprofessionals are often considered as the key links to the community for the agency, they are seldom able to effect agency policy, service delivery patterns or priorities in any way. In only one agency, Agency A, where upgrading opportunities are unlimited, did they play a significant role in policymaking.

At the same time, a number of NCEY graduates have risen to policymaking positions on neighborhood organization boards within their communities. This is noteworthy at a time when pressures for local control of service institutions are increasing.

All agencies reported that attitudes of community residents are changing throughout the city. The grateful beneficiary is becoming the demanding consumer. Quiescent populations, properly appreciative of agencies' services and staff interest on their behalf, are less and less in evidence in New York today.

The old distinctions between boards, staffs and clients are blurring: Lay boards composed of distinguished citizens from outside the community are being replaced by boards drawn from the community, in agencies employing indigenous staff from the same community. Today, board and staff are viewed as equally accountable to the community being served. Paraprofessionals representing both the community and the agency require the redefinition of roles for staff and constituency.

The traditional professional, loyal to the principles of his profession, trained in specialized and discrete functions, possessed with high-level expertise acquired through academic training, is now called upon to demonstrate loyalty first and foremost to the needs of the community, and to be responsive to a live constituency. Even modes of professional behavior are modifying to conform to community imposed standards; The community does not value unemotional detachment and objectivity in professionals. Today's professional is expected to demonstrate commitment, involvement and advocacy of client and consumer needs to institutions and established agencies. Paraprofessionals and community activists are expected to behave in the same way.

These changes in mode and the merging of lines were found in all the agencies studied. In Agency E, for example, where paraprofessionals perceive of themselves as the vanguard of the community in the agency, they have demanded with some success that the interests of the community be served as they perceive it. They express the view that many of the old professionals are like colonial administrators from the "old world". As paraprofessionals working within their own community within a dual role concept, they see themselves in an analagous position to the indigenous worker in Africa in the last stages of the British civil service: having been on the inside they know more about the service than many of the other residents of the community. Furthermore, they see their interest and that of the community as joined. In seeking to advance their own positions they are also seeking to advance the influence of the community in the agency and on the service.

In agencies where opportunities were limited to the entry level or with no access to higher level jobs, the drive towards community control was found to be presenting alternate opportunities for advancement. The thrust towards decentralization and community control in many services has increased opportunities to politicize situations and to fill political vacuums. For community residents and paraprofessionals, there are political positions to be jockeyed for.

The current situation is illustrated by the comparative experiences of two NCEY graduates, one with an agency offering unlimited opportunity and another in an agency of limited paraprofessional opportunity:

Both men are young, black and highly committed to the interests of the community. The former has moved to a position of influence in his employer agency. There is no conflict between his personal needs, those of the community and those of the agency. Their objectives are common. The job is so challenging and demanding that he has neither time nor need for outside involvement. He is expected to advocate community interests, to make an impact on policy, to develop his capacities and to continue to advance.

His counterpart reported a very different experience in the other agency. Within his employer agency, he has one of the most repetitive jobs held by NCEY graduates. His job involves testing manual skills in a variety of tasks. None of his leadership or organizational skills are utilized, and the job provides no opportunities for creative responses to community needs. He has advanced considerably however within his community where he holds a board position on the community corporation and serves as chairman of his neighborhood board. Interested in urban affairs, he takes college courses on his own initiative.

In the latter case, the paraprofessionals' knowledge of the community is neither utilized by the agency nor even valued by his supervisor who observed that this young man was "wasting his time meeting with groups and writing constitutions and taking irrelevant courses on Urbanology, whatever that is." The contrast is sharp between the high esteem in which he is held in a major ghetto community and the lack of opportunities provided by his job for effecting programs, policy and service determinations. The community provides opportunity to advance; the agency does not; the community highly values and employs his abilities. The agency reports that he has no future in his present field without a master's degree. He has a job in the agency and a career in the community, and this lack of relation between his two roles results in a schism that tends to reinforce polarization of on-going conflicts.

One agency supervisor expressed the anxiety engendered by the current situation in the form of a rhetorical question:

"With a community voice becoming increasingly more powerful in this agency, what will happen to us professionals? When they open all opportunities to neighborhood people, where will we go?"

Another supervisor observed:

"The paraprofessional represents the pole of the community, while I as a supervisor represent the pole of the professional. Then another factor gets introduced into this issue: black/white polarization. The black represents the community to which the agency is directing its service, and the supervisors who are primarily white represent union-protected professionals in middle management. This situation currently is aggravated by the fact that paraprofessionals

are still in provisional employment status, whereas the supervisors and professionals have permanent status, tenure and full protection of their rights. These protective rights are not available yet to paraprofessionals even though they have been working here for three years. This long wait for the institutionalization of paraprofessional positions in this agency have created anxieties for all of us by serving to aggravate and not diminish polarization."

This supervisor concluded:

"If the aspirations of individuals are not met by the organization employing him, then he is a threat, particularly when he can compare his options to those of other people aroung him and find himself in an untenable situation. Since he realistically perceives that the double standard is operating, he can do nothing about it and apparently no one else is doing anything about it. It is clear that there is no equivalency of opportunity at the present time."

The introduction to this report noted that when NCEY completed its training program, it was an achievement to open up opportunities to paraprofessionals in the human services field. The NCEY graduates were grateful for these opportunities.

Since 1966, the climate has changed drastically and so have the attitudes of the graduates. As a result of the drive for community control and decentralization, community residents feel entitled to meaningful roles within service agencies. They are no longer grateful for entry-level positions nor are they satisfied to remain at that level. The national new careers movement's major thrust is for increased career mobility, higher education opportunities and greater community control. This is the view of the New York City New Careers Council. It was found to be that of the NCEY graduates as well.

In all agencies offering limited opportunities for advancement, paraprofessionals reported increasing dissatisfaction. The disparities between opportunities and income available to young white college graduates and to themselves were creating particular discontent. The agencies reported feeling the impact of the drive for opportunities for paraprofessional advancement, for greater minority group participation in public services, as well as the movement for community control. These highly dynamic factors are operative everywhere in New York City. The two available answers are either merging paraprofessional and agency interests or polarizing conflicting interests.

The point of view of most paraprofessionals indicates that unless there is an acceleration of the opening of opportunities for paraprofessional advancement, polarization between paraprofessionals and agencies will intensify and lead increasing numbers of paraprofessionals to merge their interests with those of the community in opposition to the agency.

There was general concurrence among NCEY graduates and the staffs of the agencies employing them that human service agencies are currently in a state of transition and that the roles of the paraprofessional and the community are closely intertwined; the acceleration of opportunities for community input and paraprofessional advancement were reported by all to be concerns of highest priority.

PART THREE

WHERE DO THEY GO FROM HERE?

CHAPTER X

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the experiences of the 26 NCEY graduates in the eight agencies, a number of conclusions can be drawn. First, the graduates proved beyond doubt that they are more than capable of performing a wide variety of generalist tasks in the human services, performing them better in many cases than professionals. Second, the agencies generally rewarded the paraprofessionals with sizeable raises, much higher than many had expected. Third, the paraprofessionals rewarded the agencies in turn, by being extremely stable employees, although there is reason to believe that the limited movement to other jobs was influenced significantly by the lack of better opportunities for paraprofessionals elsewhere. And last-- and most relevant to this report--the study confirmed what everyone had suspected: that opportunities for genuine career advancement for paraprofessionals are either severely limited or completely nonexistent. Only one agency in our study proved an exception to this rule.

The obstacles to career advancement were many--civil service requirements, professional standards, lack of supplementary training and education, etc.--but one obstacle dominated them all: the insistence in all but one agency on baccalaureate degrees for eligibility to higher level jobs. During the early days of the NCEY training program many people had hoped that the very presence of paraprofessionals on the job, demonstrating their ability and performing at high levels, would induce changes in the long-established promotion policies of agencies in the human services. It was disappointing to find that even the newer voluntary agencies, unbound by authorizations to adhere to established standards, chose to do so anyway. They established standards levels and grades remarkably similar to those in agencies long governed by civil service. The only distinguishable difference between those agencies and the older ones under civil service requiring bachelor's degrees was the allowable "out" in some cases for individuals with "equivalent experience." But since these agencies did not define what they meant by "equivalent, paraprofessionals still were not able to plan to meet the specific criteria that would enable them to advance.

Like the lost nail to the lost shoe, the general adherence to academic degrees as the hallmark of eligibility perpetuated the existence of other obstacles to advancement. For example, the failure of agencies to spell out alternative requirements for advancement made it impossible for agencies to create career ladders to which paraprofessionals would be eligible. The absence of career ladders precluded agencies from providing career counseling and training for higher level jobs, since none were available for those without college degrees.

There was also a serious absence of standards establishing equivalency among different agencies in the human services for experience in paraprofessional jobs. With so many job titles being used and no uniform pattern of job descriptions for those titles, neither employer agencies nor employment counselors could easily direct paraprofessionals to alternative job opportunities. They had little way of knowing what prior experience can be built upon or what additional skills would be needed on another job with the same title. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the movement by paraprofessionals between jobs has been generally slow except when impelled by the imminent closeout of a program. And when this has happened paraprofessionals have had to fall back on the local grapevine or on the resources of the employment service for information about available jobs. Without the help of career planning, makeshift decisions are likely to sometimes result in career advancement but just as often in setbacks, particularly at times like the present when federal, state and municipal governments are cutting back on funds for human services and thus for opportunities for paraprofessionals as well. Indeed the current budgetary limitations threaten to be the largest obstacle ahead to career advancement opportunities for paraprofessionals.

If agencies continue to demand academic credentials for career mobility, it is incumbent upon them to help paraprofessionals to attain them. Only a very few agencies in our study were doing so. Under pressures from unions and the federal government they were providing opportunities for education leading to an associate degree. But these agencies were found to be in a race with time to modify their own eligibility requirement for bachelor's degrees before the paraprofessionals completed their study and were ready with their associate degrees to move on to the promised higher-level jobs.

Moreover, even if the agencies modified their requirements in time, the paraprofessionals with associate degrees will have a serious question for these agencies to answer: How much of the formal education they received was truly relevant to the jobs they then became eligible for? For the only basis on which it can be fair to expect paraprofessionals to go through the arduous task of getting a degree is when it can be demonstrated that the education is truly needed to perform the tasks required on the desired job. Life circumstances, after all, generally prohibit paraprofessionals from pursuing education for its own sake. Men and women in their thirties, forties and fifties with heavy family responsibilities cannot often afford to go to school full-time or to go part-time for eight or ten years merely to acquire the ticket to eligibility for work they were quite capable of performing before they went back to school. In current work settings, where job functions are blurred, where paraprofessionals and professionals are often performing the same tasks or where the distinctions are blatantly arbitrary, the importance of further education in terms of the work to be done is far from clear.

And this, of course, is the central issue: How much should agencies continue to rely on educational credentials as the stamp of eligibility for higher level work? In our study agencies generally either adhered to them totally or, in one case, dropped them completetely. This one agency chose instead to measure eligibility for advancement on the basis of proven performance in lower level jobs and on demonstrations of ability to relate to and communicate on a human level with clients and other staff. The results of this policy have proven emminently satisfactory in the view of the agency and have more than demonstrated the value of tailoring requirements to meet the specific needs of specific agencies in accordance with the services they are seeking to provide.

The particular approach of this agency may not be suitable to many other agencies. It may not always be possible or even desirable to completely dispense with academic criteria, particularly when an agency seeks to provide highly specialized professional services. But between the all or nothing approach to educational credentials lies a vast middle ground that is not being filled.

To really explore this middle ground and determine what educational or other qualifications are actually needed for the performance of the different tasks to be done, an agency needs to do what is generally most difficult for institutions and individuals alike: it needs to turn inward and truly evaluate how well it is meeting the goals it has set for itself. It needs to measure the effectiveness of its services in meeting the needs of its clients. It needs to take stock of its current services before it can determine how to maximally use its staff, professional and paraprofessionals, to better those services. As important as are modifications in hiring and promotion practices, it won't be enough to simply create new job titles or new job requirements or new civil service lines. These, after all, will be arbitrary standards too, opening up doors for some, closing them for others. The only way not to be arbitrary is to base the structuring of jobs and the qualifications required for those jobs on the content of the work that is needed to best deliver the services to the clients to be served. And, as the findings in this study made clear, the ability , insight and potential of paraprofessionals to help improve those services have only begun to be used.

CHAPTER XI

RECOMMENDATIONS

The guarantee of equal employment opportunity is meaningless unless there is also a guarantee of equal opportunity for advancement. We urgently recommend that the Congress and the agencies funding paraprofessional programs issue a national declaration to that effect. Eligibility for career mobility must not be limited only to holders of higher education degrees, but should be offered as well to all individuals who can demonstrate the ability to perform at the required level. Until and unless alternative qualifications for employment advancement are established, there can be no true equality of opportunity for paraprofessionals.

There are three routes to the implementation of such a national policy: (1) through measures designed to help paraprofessionals advance within the current framework of agency hiring policies and job structures; (2) through measures designed to help agencies change that framework; and (3) through measures designed to help fields of service re-evaluate the total framework of their services and use of manpower. A mandate to follow all three routes is needed. But such a mandate, if it is to be more than rhetoric, must be backed up by sufficient funds from all levels of government.

FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

Until the current framework of agency programs and policies can be changed--or even while it is being changed--it is necessary to provide paraprofessionals with: (a) help in taking advantage of the existing opportunities for advancement; (b) increased access to opportunities for higher education; and (c) strengthened training programs. To accomplish this:

1. A central career counseling service for paraprofessionals should be established. Its goal should be to help paraprofessionals develop and carry out both short-and long-range plans for advancement. By providing information and advice, it should assist paraprofessionals identify their interests and abilities, learn about new opportunities, and select positions and fields consonant with those interests and abilities. Even within the present framework of limited opportunities for paraprofessionals, such a counseling service could be of immense help by systematically disseminating available information and helping paraprofessionals make the best use of the opportunities that exist.

2. Access to higher education by paraprofessionals needs to be vastly accelerated. If substantial numbers are to achieve professional status under existing circumstances, greatly increased opportunities must be developed to provide the time and means for college study. Needed is a "G.I. Bill of Rights" fpr paraprofessionals providing scholarships, released time with pay, work-study internships, credit for work-experience, tuition advances and other financial incentives. For adults who have been out of school for a substantial period, there is a need for special programs which prepare them for college through intensive pre-college studies that revive and improve learning skills. To

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 039 281 UD 009 972

AUTHOR	Gould, Karolyn R.
TITLE	Where Do We Go From Here? A Study of the Roads and Roadblocks to Career Mobility for Paraprofessionals Working in Human Service Agencies.
INSTITUTION	National Committee on Employment of Youth, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	158p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.00
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Opportunities, Career Planning, Community Agencies (Public), Disadvantaged Youth, *Employment Practices, Human Services, Job Training, Minority Groups, *Nonprofessional Personnel, *Occupational Mobility
IDENTIFIERS	*National Committee On The Employment of Youth

ABSTRACT

This report gives the findings of a study designed to identify obstacles to career mobility among paraprofessionals in social service agencies and to make recommendations for opening channels for advancement. The experiences of a group of paraprofessionals hired in a special project in 1965 and 1966 by the National Committee on Employment of Youth (NCEY) provided data for the study. Obstacles were civil service requirements, professional standards, lack of supplementary training and education, and the insistence of a B.A. degree for eligibility to higher level jobs. Implementation of a national policy of guarantee of equal opportunity for advancement, (1) through measures designed to help paraprofessionals advance within the current framework of agency hiring policies and job structures, (2) through measures designed to help agencies change that framework, and (3) through measures designed to help fields of service re-evaluate the total framework of their services and use of manpower, is recommended. Specific ways of implementing the above recommendations are summarized. Appended are background information on the NCEY questionnaire, and a list of agencies employing and/or training NCEY graduates. (KG)

ED039281

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH
145 EAST 32nd STREET
NEW YORK, N.Y., 10016

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

A STUDY OF THE ROADS AND ROADBLOCKS TO CAREER MOBILITY FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS WORKING IN HUMAN SERVICE AGENCIES

Conducted under a grant from the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor. The opinions expressed are those of the National Committee on Employment of Youth.

UD009972

December 1969

Karolyn R. Gould, Project Director
James Smith, Research Associate
Terri Masi, Administrative Secretary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS i

INTRODUCTION ii-1

PART ONE: THE STUDY

CHAPTER ONE METHODOLOGY 1-1

CHAPTER TWO AGENCIES AND TRAINEES: AN OVERVIEW 2-1

CHAPTER THREE THE CASE STUDIES 3-1

PART TWO: THE FINDINGS

CHAPTER FOUR HOW FAR WERE THEY ABLE TO GO? 4-1

CHAPTER FIVE ON THE JOB: THE TASKS PERFORMED 5-1

CHAPTER SIX TRAINING, EDUCATION AND CAREER MOBILITY 6-1

CHAPTER SEVEN SUPERVISION AND CAREER MOBILITY 7-1

CHAPTER EIGHT THE IMPACT OF CIVIL SERVICE, PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS AND UNIONS 8-1

CHAPTER NINE PARAPROFESSIONALS, AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITY 9-1

PART THREE: WHERE DO THEY GO FROM HERE?

CHAPTER TEN SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS 10-1

CHAPTER ELEVEN RECOMMENDATIONS 11-1

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A BACKGROUND ON THE NCEY TRAINING PROGRAM A-1

APPENDIX B TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE B

APPENDIX C LIST OF AGENCIES EMPLOYING AND/OR TRAINING NCEY GRADUATES C-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
TABLE A	Comparative Profile of Paraprofessional Characteristics	2-2
TABLE B	Code for Employers and NCEY Graduates	2-4
TABLE C	Comparison of Starting and Current Salaries	4-3
TABLE D	Post-Training Movement Patterns of Earning Levels	4-3
TABLE E	Tasks Performed in Paraprofessional Jobs	5-3
TABLE F	Breakdown of Tasks Performed	5-4
TABLE G	Paraprofessional Self-Evaluation of Task Performance	5-9
TABLE H	Where Tasks Were Learned	6-2
TABLE I	Types of Training Provided by Eight Agencies	6-5
TABLE J	Education Profile of Study Sample	6-5
TABLE K	Paraprofessional Assessments of Supervision in Eight Agencies	7-8

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are indebted to many individuals and agencies who helped us to undertake, pursue and complete this report. Among them:

Karolyn R. Gould, the project's director, who carried the major responsibility for conducting the study, analyzing the findings and preparing this report.

James Smith, research associate on the project staff, himself a former NCEY-trained paraprofessional, who conducted the interviews with the graduates and contributed substantially to all other phases of the project as well.

Edith Lynton, author of a number of prior NCEY studies of paraprofessionals, who served as a consultant to the project staff.

Joel Seldin, who participated in planning and implementing several important phases of the study.

Terri Masi, administrative secretary for the project, who was responsible for all details from the first memo through the fiftieth tally of data to the final page of this report.

The staff of the original training program, Seymour Lesh, Deborah Lesser and Mildred Safar, who shared their experience and knowledge with us.

The Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor, which provided the sine qua non -- the funds to do the job.

The staffs of the agencies surveyed.

And, finally, the graduates of the NCEY training program, without whose cooperation not a word of the report that follows could have been written.

Eli E. Cohen, Executive Secretary
National Committee on Employment
of Youth

INTRODUCTION

Few people anticipated the force with which the movement for new careers would sweep through the nation. Four years ago it was only an idea. Today in all parts of the country tens of thousands of individuals, without previous experience and without professional credentials in the human services, are working in schools, welfare bureaus, employment agencies, hospitals, community action and other agencies under programs funded by OEO, HEW and the U.S. Department of Labor. The idea has become an indisputable fact.

The successful placement of so many unemployed or under-employed persons in totally new jobs or in jobs generally reserved for those of different backgrounds is certainly a considerable achievement. Indeed they have been absorbed into these institutions with far less difficulty than originally predicted. The early fears of many professionals and traditional civil service personnel have been dispelled or transformed into a recognition of the substantial contribution paraprofessionals can make.

At the same time any objective assessment of the situation must lead to the parallel conclusion that this large national experiment in the creation of "new careers" is in danger of remaining stalled at the level of deadend jobs. The major failure has been the inability to provide new careerists with opportunities to advance through career ladders beyond the entry level.

The problem of mobility was predictable. Even on a purely theoretical basis, it proved easier to formulate a variety of new entry-level jobs in human services than to link these jobs with more responsible or demanding levels of work in both new agencies and traditional institutions. But some theorists believed the major difficulty would lie in getting new careerists into the established system of human service provision. They reasoned that once the paraprofessionals were in, their presence alone would have sufficient impact to change old structures or to create new career paths. Generally, those who adhered to this viewpoint were concerned more with improving the relationship between service agencies and the community than with the manpower implications of the new careers movement. To those who viewed the paraprofessional as a major manpower instrument, it was clear that career mobility, except in the case of exceptional individuals or special circumstances, would not just happen by itself. They realized that the restructuring of traditional hierarchies and the development of new systems of personnel would be a complex process to conceptualize and still more complex to implement. In the face of structural impediments and resistances, they knew that systematic and coordinated career planning would be required.

It should be recognized, however, that in 1965 there was little concrete experience with paraprofessionals on which to base estimates of their capacities for growth. Today the need for career planning no longer has to be based solely on theory. The concrete experiences of large numbers of paraprofessionals can serve as the material for study.

The rapid upsurge in the employment of paraprofessionals in the human services, moreover, makes it essential at this point to review what has taken place over the past four years. We need to assess the degree of career mobility experienced by the paraprofessionals. We need to identify those factors which made mobility possible and those factors which obstructed it. Such knowledge may then be applied in assessing other programs employing paraprofessionals, in eliminating obstacles to advancement where they exist, and in facilitating greater opportunities for mobility as well.

The question of how to achieve genuine upward mobility for new careerists can be pursued in several ways. One is to examine the paraprofessionals themselves: Are there, for example, factors in their own backgrounds or in their abilities which prevent them from advancing? Or is the failure in the lack of supportive services that employers provide to help them advance?

Another direction of inquiry would be to look at the job design. Are the entry level jobs themselves unsuitable for the building of further steps in the career structure, or has there simply been a failure to plan beyond the entry level? A further route would be to explore whether the trouble lies in the availability or accessibility of additional education or training to qualify those employed for higher level responsibilities. Finally, consideration would have to be given to the obstacles to the fuller development of new careerists caused by the policies of unions, professionals, civil service, funding sources and licensing and credentialling institutions.

THE NCEY PROGRAM

The experiences of a group of paraprofessionals trained in a special project in 1965 and 1966, by the National Committee on Employment of Youth and then employed by a variety of public and private human service agencies, served as a microcosm for an intensive pilot study of career mobility. This training project, one of the first to enroll paraprofessionals, influenced many projects that followed, and provides the longest period of follow-up--nearly four years--of any paraprofessional study to date.

Over a two-year period, 118 paraprofessionals completed training. More than half were placed immediately in jobs related to their training in 34 agencies. They held 20 different job titles, ranging from Assistant Teacher to Job Developer, and Vocational Evaluator to Youth Advisor.

The NCEY 12-week training program for paraprofessionals was repeated for six cycles of some 20 enrollees each. The training components--classroom and on-the-job--had a twofold effect. First, to the employing agencies, it often represented the first opportunity to hire paraprofessionals trained for the job, and therefore stimulated some reassessment of agency job requirements. As a result in some cases, former professional functions were reassigned to paraprofessionals. Second, the trainees were furnished with new skills and launched into new work settings different from the generally unskilled jobs they had formerly held.

As the program ended, there was reason for optimism on the part of the trainees, the agencies and NCEY. The trainees had demonstrated greater capacity than had been expected. The agencies reported that the paraprofessionals had positive contributions to make, and NCEY found its role of broker or matchmaker between trainees and agencies beneficial to both.

It should be noted that there was also satisfaction initially with the resulting new employment opportunities for paraprofessionals This was a significant accomplishment at the time. The issue of career mobility for paraprofessionals arose subsequently, once the use of paraprofessionals had been institutionalized and their value was no longer questioned by the employing agencies. Then it became apparent that it was not sufficient to replace one dead-end job with another and that the future of paraprofessionals had to include a promise of some degree of career mobility as well as increasing diversity of career opportunities.

HOW TO INCREASE CAREER MOBILITY

Since the NCEY training program ended, many approaches have been suggested and developed to deal with the problem of increasing career mobility for paraprofessionals. The following alternatives are being proposed or tried:

1) A total restructuring of jobs in human services so that new possibilities for mobility will be created.

2) Special training to open up opportunities for advancement and to increase options for different kinds of employment.

3) Newly designed higher education programs--more related to job needs than traditional education--for new categories of staff drawn from minority groups residing in low-income areas.

4) The establishment of a new academic credential, an associate degree for paraprofessional staff.

5) The blurring or ending of traditional differentiations between professional and paraprofessional functions in the human services, on the theory that traditional professional education does not prepare individuals for work in poverty areas with minority group populations.

Because opinions are proliferating so quickly, there is need for experience-based knowledge upon which to draw judgments of the correct alternatives. The NCEY demonstration program provides the opportunity for a retrospective view of three to four years' experience, a sufficient time period for individuals to have advanced on the job

Because enough time had elapsed since the NCEY Training Program was completed to yield meaningful information, the U.S. Department of Labor in November, 1968 made a grant to the National Committee on Employment of Youth to conduct a 6-month study for the following purposes:

1. To identify and locate the graduates of NCEY's training program, to examine their experiences with respect to advancement on the job, and to evaluate their impact on the job structure and service delivery in the agencies where they were employed.

2. To assess the experiences of the employing agencies in providing upward mobility to graduates of the NCEY training program.

3. To the extent that the findings in one and two above would permit, to develop guides for building in greater upward mobility in new careers programs.

4. To the extent that three above was feasible, to develop a demonstration program to test one or more models for achieving maximal upward mobility for subprofessionals.

PART ONE

THE STUDY

CHAPTER I

METHODOLOGY

For its approach to the study, NCEY decided to conduct a case study of a small sample of the agencies that were employing the NCEY graduates. It was reasoned that graduates would have had experiences with a wide number of agencies. If the main objectives had been to measure the degree of mobility that each of them achieved, a trainee-oriented approach would have been called for. But that was not the case. The main objective was rather to measure the impact of paraprofessionals on the agencies and to search out and identify those factors that had contributed to or impeded opportunities for mobility.

Through an in-depth study of a small sample, it was hypothesized that multi-variant factors could be examined thoroughly to reveal those having had an impact, for good or bad, on mobility. In addition the most relevant questions could be identified and made available for subsequent follow-up studies on the career mobility of paraprofessionals.

The selection of agencies was to be based on establishing a (1) cross-section of fields of service, i.e., health , employment, education, community action; (2) cross-section of auspices, i.e., public and private; (3) cross-section of size, i.e., small, medium and large . An additional consideration was making sure the agency employed enough NCEY graduates; at least two per agency and hopefully more, were desired.

LOCATING THE GRADUATES

The first job was to learn where the NCEY graduates were located. A variety of techniques to find them were used: letters phone calls, leads from graduates who had been found about those who had not, and last, a meeting in the form of a reunion for all NCEY graduates. The objectives of the reunion were to (1) get more leads on the present whereabouts of missing graduates, and (2) to get direct feedback from the NCEY graduates on their experiences since they completed the training program and to secure a group sense--if not consensus--on the range of experiences and opportunities and obstacles encountered in the course of pursuing new careers in the human services.

When the efforts to locate graduates were suspended, 83 had been reached, 3 were found to be deceased or ill and 33 of the original 118 graduates had still not been located. However, since more than a representative sample had already been identified, it was unnecessary to pursue the search further for those who had not been found.

A classification system was used to record the data secured about the employment histories of the NCEY graduates. Individual employment histories were constructed for each graduate. A separate record was established for each agency that had employed a graduate, so that employer histories with NCEY graduates could be readily perceived. The objective of this classification system was to provide the data base for the selection of agencies for case study. Using the criteria for cross-representation already noted, eight agencies were selected. Among them, they employed 26 NCEY graduates.

DEVELOPING THE CASE STUDY DESIGN

On the basis of NCEY's knowledge of paraprofessional programs, the design for the case studies was developed. The objective was to provide through the studies not only an overview of each agency, but also an overview of all the agencies by topical clusters. The topics selected for the study included: (1) agency structure, (2) agency policy, (3) agency training, (4) agency-provided education, (5) agency supervision, (6) agency civil service, union or professional credentialing requirements, and, (7) the former trainees.

The methodology called for securing the data for each topical cluster from a variety of sources. As most of the responses would be subjective judgments, it was necessary to cross-check views and perceptions on each topic to reduce the possibility of distortion and increase the probability of accuracy. It was considered desirable to identify the frequency of similarity of perceptions and the frequency of differences between paraprofessionals and staff members on the same question. For each agency under study, therefore, the plan called for a series of interviews, when applicable, with:

1. The agency executive for an articulation from the point of view of the agency itself.

2. The graduates' supervisors within the agency.
3. The training director at the agency.
4. Any outside education agency used by the employer in behalf of the former trainees.
5. A principal source of information about the civil service, union and credentialing policies of the particular agency.
6. The NCEY graduates within the agency.

THE INTERVIEWS

Interviews were held with each of the 26 NCEY graduates working in the agencies and with 37 agency and agency-related personnel, including executives, personnel staff, unit directors, college staff and other sources of information about activities in particular areas, such as career planning and job restructuring, that could have impact on the agencies being studied. Through field study, data was obtained for the measurement of mobility achieved by the graduates.

The instrument used for the interviews with NCEY graduates was designed with the topical format already noted.* However, within each topical area, there were a series of open-ended questions. The total instrument was somewhat structured so that both interagency and intra-agency analyses could be made of the responses.

The interviews with the trainees were conducted by a research associate of the project team who had himself been a trainee of the original NCEY program. The objective was to establish peer-level interaction and thereby create as unthreatening a climate for the interview as possible. The expectation was that communication would be less likely to be qualified or censored to meet the preconceived expectations of the interviewer than is generally the case. This proved to be a successful approach and produced highly informative data. Put roughly, the questioning of graduates pertained to factual information on employment tenure, mobility, wages, etc; a listing of the tasks performed on the job rated according to the amount of time spent on each; an evaluation of the supervision offered; an evaluation of the training offered within and outside the agency; the opportunities and obstacles to career advancement; the availability of educational opportunities; and reactions to the employment in general.

---

* See appendix for sample questionnaire

The interviews of the agency personnel were not structured. However, they followed the same topical format. Field testing of a more structured questionnaire had revealed deficiencies rather quickly, since agencies varied significantly in structure, policy and relationship with the former trainees. Using an individualized approach within the topical format, it was possible to obtain multiple judgments , perceptions and experiences with greater clarity.

CHAPTER II

THE TRAINEES and THE AGENCIES: AN OVERVIEW

The characteristics of the sample of 26 graduates employed by the eight agencies under study were compared with those of the total of 83 NCEY graduates about whom information had been obtained. In addition, the availability of findings from a national study conducted by the New Careers Institute of the University Research Corporation in Washington, D.C. enabled us to compare the characteristics of the NCEY training group with those of a much larger nationwide sample.

Table A on the following page shows what we found. In brief, the comparison revealed a number of differences. The NCEY group contained a much greater proportion of men than in the national sample, as well as a greater proportion of Spanish-speaking and a smaller proportion of white enrollees. In addition, the NCEY group included more individuals who had attended college.

But the similarities far outweighed the differences. Individuals in both the NCEY group and in the national sample were on the average relatively young with the women several years older than the men. More than two-thirds were Negro, close to half were high school graduates, a little over a third were married and the great majority had been unemployed before beginning their training.

THE AGENCIES

The eight agencies selected for case study are representative as a group of the kinds of agencies employing paraprofessionals in the delivery of services to residents of low-income communities in New York City. They include :

TABLE A

COMPARATIVE PROFILE OF PARAPROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	New Careers Institute Nationwide Sample	70% (83) NCEY Training Graduates	26 NCEY Graduates, Study Sample
Sex:			
Male	20%	44%	42%
Female	80%	56%	58%
Average Age:			
Male	28	26	26
Female	31	33	34
Education:			
Less than H.S.	48%	28%	35%
H.S. Graduate	46%	48%	46%
Some College	6%	24%	19%
Marital Status:			
Married	38%	n.a.	35%
Single, divorced, separated, widowed	62%	n.a.	65%
Ethnic Breakdown:			
Negro	74%	76%	70%
White	20%	1%	0%
Spanish-speaking (Puerto Rican, Cuban, Panamanian, etc.)	6%	23%	30%
Employment Record:			
Pre-Training			
Unemployed	89%	69%	81%
Employed	11%	31%	19%
Post-Training EMPLOYERS			
Health	43%	14%	27%
Education	32%	4%	8%
Law Enforcement	12%	0%	0%
Multi-Service Community	n.a.	49%	22%
Public Service	n.a.	16%	27%
Other	13%	0%	0%
Out of Labor Market	n.a.	7%	8%
Unemployed	n.a.	10%	8%

N.A.= not available

> Two voluntary non-profit agencies operating multi-service programs in geographically circumscribed areas.
>
> Two public agencies providing employment services and operating within the civil service system.
>
> One voluntary agency providing community mental health services within a hospital and university medical college complex.
>
> One public agency specializing in addiction control and treatment and operating under civil service.
>
> One voluntary agency offering comprehensive services to pre-school children and their families, operated by two non-profit sponsors.
>
> One voluntary hospital, formerly a municipal hospital, operating in a major ghetto, under the auspices of a large university.

Five of the eight agencies were established within the last decade. Their operations depend upon the continued availability of federal funds. The other three agencies are long established, but utilize paraprofessionals in new programs or new services that are also federally funded.

The eight agencies probably represent a much wider number of agencies in terms of the range of opportunities for advancement that they offer paraprofessionals. The spectrum runs from agencies where paraprofessionals are considered eligible for entry-level jobs only to one agency that provides unlimited opportunities for paraprofessionals to advance to administrative and managerial positions.

Each of the eight agencies was assigned a code letter, from A through H. Each trainee was designated by the employing agency's code and a number in the sequence of the total NCEY trainees employed there. The following table delineates the code symbols in use throughout the study:

TABLE B

CODE USED TO IDENTIFY EMPLOYER AGENCIES AND NCEY GRADUATES

Agency Symbols	No. NCEY Graduates	NCEY Graduates Symbols
A	2	A1,AB2*
B	8	B1,BA2*,B3,B4, B5,B6,B7,B8
C	3	C1,C2,C3
D	2	D1,D2
E	2	E1,E2
F	3	F1,F2,F3
G	4	G1,G2,G3,G4
H	3	H1,H2,H3

* Employed by two agencies in study.

CHAPTER III

THE CASE STUDIES

The experiences of the 26 NCEY graduates in the eight agencies were studied in depth, and, with one important exception, revealed remarkable similarities in agency policies and practices toward paraprofessionals. Part Two of this report summarizes and analyzes these similarities, as well as the differences, in detail. To avoid repetition we have mainly confined the case studies that follow to a description of the major impact of paraprofessional employment on each of the NCEY graduates and to the impact they and other paraprofessionals had during their employ on the eight agencies. Hopefully the case studies will give the reader a sense of both the variety and sameness of the situations experienced before proceeding to the general findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

AGENCY A

Agency A is a municipal agency with city-wide responsibility for the prevention and control of drug addiction and the rehabilitation of drug addicts.

The agency, which was established in 1966, operates from a central headquarters in the City Hall area through a complex of neighborhood offices and addiction treatment centers throughout the city. Its staff is composed of individuals selected for their knowledge of the addict personality and their ability to work successfully with addicts. Some are former addicts themselves. The agency places little emphasis on academic degrees for either employment or for promotion. Instead, it actively pursues a policy of internal staff development and promotions from within.

The agency has established a six-level job structure that is continuous from the entry or aide level to the principal specialist or top level of jobs. Since no existing civil service structure was found to meet the agency's needs, it was able to design its own civil service series, which, though still provisional, is close to being accorded permanent status. No distinctions were made initially between paraprofessionals and professionals.

Two NCEY graduates are employed in the agency. Among all the NCEY graduates included in the sample, these two have achieved the highest level, both in terms of status or position and in terms of income. Within the agency's job structure, A-1 has achieved the Grade 5 level, that of a supervising specialist. He has management responsibilities and earns an annual income of $10,300. He currently is acting deputy director of the operations unit and expects to be named as the permanent director shortly. His colleague, AB-2, is at the Grade 4 level, senior specialist. He is earning $ 8,500 a year and serves as corrdinator for the agency's program in a major ghetto area.

Both NCEY graduates in Agency A are young males, respectively 32 and 27 years of age. Both are married and have families. Before enrolling in the NCEY training program, A-1 had completed 15 years of school; AB-2 had not completed high school. At the time the training began, the former was employed as a hospital aide and the latter was unemployed.

For both NCEY graduates, Agency A has provided a maximum opportunity for career advancement and job satisfaction. The agency also assesses their job performance very highly, both in terms of present performance and potential.

A principal feature of the agency's approach to addiction is the use of group encounter techniques which open people to awareness of their own feelings and encourage the expression of emotion. A-1 is both a practitioner and a leader trainer in group encounter techniques, which the agency calls Attitudinal Skills Training. In the agency's view he is first-rate in this role. A-1 is extremely optimistic about his future in the agency. He explains that he has found the right place for himself, a place where he is valued, where his abilities are used to the utmost and where his personal growth is encouraged and rewarded. He sees the agency as a lifetime career opportunity with which he is well satisfied. He notes that the agency has been satisfied with his work and does not require additional education. However he has been thinking about it and would consider completing his college education if some form of assistance and opportunity became available.

NCEY graduate AB-2 is rated by his supervisor as one of the best of the agency's field coordinators. He too is commended for his ability to relate to people and motivate them. His job requires him to organize community groups for the prevention of addiction, as well as to involve addicts in the process of rehabilitation. In these activities, the agency reports his record is outstanding, and he has been asked to develop a master plan for all of the field units. AB-2 also reports that he views the agency as a lifetime career opportunity, that will provide him with ample room to grow. Although he has not completed high school, AB-2 indicates no desire to pursue his education at present.

Agency A is the exception among the agencies referred to throughout this report, It provides exceptional career mobility opportunities for paraprofessionals. It offers unlimited advancement opportunities equal to those generally available only to college graduates. It promotes communication among staff, clients and management consciously. Its structure reflects its policies and its policies reflect a distinct affirmation of the individual's capacity to grow, change and develop.

This agency is also an exception in the way it works with clients and the community as partners. Distinctions between staff and client are blurred when addicts in the process of rehabilitation are "employed" in the addiction treatment center. In the course of the process of moving from addiction to freedom from drugs the rehabilitated addicts become staff members.

Since the agency had no established pool of personnel to draw upon (and retrain), it had to provide for internal staff development to, in effect, grow their own experienced personnel for higher level jobs. On-the-job training is provided to all staff. Promotion policies are premised on the agency's commitment to internal staff development. Lower level staff see models of mobility in higher level staff and can realistically aspire to follow them on the way up, because there are no educational obstacles: "I have made it and so can you" is the point of view.

Agency A has an operational philosophy: the belief in the individual's unlimited capacity to grow, change and develop. The emphasis is on personality growth and positive reinforcement for both addicts and staff. The agency values the ability to interact on a human level above all else. This provides the basis for selection of employees and formal education is generally considered extraneous if not irrelevant in the selection process. Indeed to the extent that formal education develops rational faculties at the expense of emotional awareness, it is viewed as a handicap.

Experience in its first few years of existence has convinced Agency A of the soundness of its approach. NCEY graduates, who would still be paraprofessionals in other agencies, have moved into upper level jobs and are regarded as high ranking staff members with no references to any deficits in education. The agency thus has no plans to shift its employment standards toward greater emphasis on formal education.

Why was Agency A able to accomplish more for the NCEY graduates than any other agency under study? Why was it the only one to provide truly unlimited opportunities within its structure for career advancement? Perhaps the most significant factor is that it is not a traditional agency dealing with traditional problems. The nature of the problem requires an approach and a type of personnel different from that found in the usual agency.

In addition Agency A was a totally new agency, unlike most other agencies under study which although using paraprofessionals for new services were themselves established institutions. Thus Agency A did not have to challenge old policies, break down old structures, soften old arteries. Rather than having to alter or accomodate to an entrenched bureacratic system, it could design its entire career ladder based solely on the services it wanted to provide and it could choose its own manpower based solely on the actual abilities needed to peform --or to learn how to perform--the tasks required to deliver those services. And that is precisely what Agency A did.

AGENCY B

Agency B was the principal employer of NCEY graduates. It is a multi-purpose agency located in a major ghetto area. It provides a range of services to clients with emphasis on youth and the prevention of delinquency. It seeks to deal with the causes rather than the consequences of pathology.

Agency B is a voluntary agency,operating through federal funding. It was established as a demonstration program several years before the NCEY training program. It therefore predates the other large multi-service community-based programs which employed NCEY graduates, all of which operate with funds provided by the Economic Opportunity Act for community action programs.

At the time of the NCEY study, Agency B was in the final phases of closing down several divisions of its operations. Its entire future was uncertain. Local community action programs were assuming responsibility and were receiving available funding to operate program addressing the same objectives.

In 1965 and 1966, when the NCEY training program was in operation, Agency B sharply contrasted with most voluntary agencies in its practice of employing paraprofessionals in a wide range of jobs. The NCEY training program, in turn, was then unique in providing generic training in the human services for people without formal education who "like to work with people." Agency B served as an on-the-job training center for a substantial number of NCEY trainees. It subsequently employed a number of trainees assigned to the agency.

A total of ten NCEY graduates were employed by Agency B. Eight of them were available for interviews. However, at the time of the study, only three NCEY graduates were still employed there: B-1, B-3 and B-4.

These three NCEY graduates are young men; two are thirty, one is twenty-nine. Two have been employed continuously by the agency since graduation for four years. The third, B-4, joined Agency B two years ago. This length of employment is reflected in the incomes received by the three graduates: B-1 and B-3 earn $ 8,193 and $ 8,131, respectively; B-4 earns $ 7,463, despite the fact that he has the highest educational achievements and a social work degree from Cuba. The others are both high school graduates, although B-3 was taking college courses when he enrolled at NCEY and continues to do so.

B-1 and B-3 have been continuously in the same job functions throughout the four-year period. As they reached the upper income limits with a particular job classification, their jobs were reclassified and they received a higher rating, and became eligible for a new series of increments. Both have received two such reclassifications in the course of their employment at Agency B. The agency job structure allows for this, by setting up qualifications for higher level jobs on the basis of academic degrees, but allowing for the exemption of previously employed staff from meeting educational requirements through the proviso that "equivalent experience" is acceptable.

B-4 had just been transferred to a new job function at the time of the study. The program which had initially employed him had been phased out through lack of funds; he was transferred to a new program operating under new funds to demonstrate a new approach to community development; training residents to serve as their own advocates for services and for changes to improve services.

At the close of four years, B-1 and B-3 reported limited satisfaction with their experiences. Awareness that the agency was closing down much of its operations presented them with the need to line up alternative employment opportunities elsewhere. They were conscious of the fact that they were receiving higher incomes at Agency B than they might expect in other human service agencies as parparofessional employees. And they were naturally reluctant to face the prospect of reducing their incomes in order to secure employment. Their supervisors credited them with performing their jobs well. They themselves reported that they were performing satisfactorily and knew their jobs thoroughly. Both B-1 and B-3 were in job functions which were highly structured: one conducted intake interviews and the other was a job evaluator, testing a variety of manual skills so that the test results could be used in career counseling for young people. The long-range interests of both NCEY graduates was in the area of community development and participation, interests they each pursued outside the agency and, in the case of B-3, through formal study. The agency provided them with no opportunity to utilize these skills and to further these interests.

Among the NCEY graduates who are no longer with the agency, three are out of the labor market, one became disabled as a result of an automobile accident, another is on maternity leave and the third has returned to school:

B-8, the NCEY graduate who has returned to school, was a woman of thirty-nine, who came from Latin America. She worked as a teaching assistant in a remedial education program. She worked with Spanish-speaking youngsters in an effort to increase their fluency in English. She reports that the job provided her with the motivation for a teaching career, although she was quite critical of limitations imposed on her role as a teaching assistant. She nevertheless reports a high level of satisfaction with her post-NCEY experience and with her future career prospects in teaching.

B-5, the NCEY graduate disabled in an automobile accident, reported a high level of satisfaction with his job at Agency B. He too was a job evaluator testing manual skills. He liked working with his hands. His supervisor indicated that he displayed great aptitude in the field of job evaluation and potential. Had the accident notoccurred, B-5"s supervisor would have encouraged him to secure academic training and become a professional job evaluator.

B-6, who is presently on maternity leave, is a young woman of 32. Although she had completed only eleven years of schooling when she enrolled in the NCEY training program, she displayed outstanding ability on the job and was cited by the agency as a most outstanding staff member. She was assigned to work in Job Corps recruitment and enrollment, and on the basis of her performance, was given increasing responsibility and autonomy. In fact, when a subsequent NCEY enrollee was placed in the agency for on-the-job training, he was assigned to B-6 for supervision. He credited her for providing him with excellent training and commented to the interviewer on the high esteem with which she was held in the agency.

The final salaries for B-5, B-6, and B-8 were respectively $ 7,343, $6,894 and $ 5,500. These reflect the limit of achievable salary for the period of employment in the agency. On the basis of the experience of the NCEY graduates still employed by Agency B, it could be expected that these salaries would have continued to advance had they remained in the agency.

Only two NCEY graduates employed by Agency B have moved on to other agencies. These are BA-2 and B-7. BA-2 is a young man currently employed at Agency A, where he has achieved a high level of job satisfaction and success. In Agency B, he was assigned to a remedial education unit as a teaching assistant. His supervisor was critical of his lack of interest in completing his own high school education, therefore he could see no career for him the field of teaching. He praised him however for his ability to relate to youth, to establish communication, and to involve youngsters in the program. These are the same skills that he is utilizing while employed at Agency A.

B-7, who also had not completed high school, was reported by his supervisor to be a shy, serious, hard-working family man. Spanish-speaking, he enjoyed assisting youth in the realization of greater opportunity. He was assigned to work with Job Corps recruitment and enrollment. Because of his concern for the needs of his family, he left Agency B when the prospect of the phasing out of the Job Corps program was imminent. He took a job with a social services department in a hospital which afforded job security on a permanent basis, even though it meant a reduction in income by $ 200 from the $ 6,200 that he was earning at Agency B. He reports that the job change has actually resulted in increasing his family income by some $ 2,000 per year, because the hours he works at the hospital enables him to hold a second job for 25 hours a week. He credits the NCEY training program and his experiences at Agency B with providing him with career opportunities which had not been available to him.

In any overall assessment of Agency B as a career opportunity for paraprofessionals, it must be noted at the time of the NCEY training program, the agency provided a maximum of opportunity in that it employed large numbers of paraprofessionals in a range of program services and provided generous increases in income for long-term employees.

From the retrospective vantage point of today, however, it did not provide well for career advancement opportunities. The agency's supervisors or executives were not able to advise NCEY graduates on alternative sources of employment when their jobs were being phased out. They did not provide career counseling nor assist paraprofessionals to secure special training or additional education which could increase their opportunities for career advancement in the future.

In the view of a number of the agency's executives, this was a serious shortcoming. They credited the agency for providing opportunities for paraprofessionals to demonstrate that they could perform well on the job without higher education degrees. On an individual basis, however, they were critical of the fact that opportunities to work with greater autonomy and at higher salaries were not accomplished by training or additional education. They were also critical of the fact that the agency had not developed true alternatives to education qualifications; they did not define what they regarded as "equivalent experience". They did not establish performance standards nor delineate prerequisite skills for higher level jobs. Such standards, in the view of several agency executives, would have enabled NCEY graduates, with assistance from the agency, to engage in career planning and would have motivated them to acquire the needed skills or knowledge or experience or job-related study. As it was they lacked aspiration to advancement.

In addition, although Agency B provided striking salary advancement there was little if any advancement in terms of job functions or responsibilities. In some cases job titles were changed in accordance with increases in salary levels, but when looked at closely the tasks performed were found to be exactly what they had been three or four years ago. As a result of the continuous salary increases without true job advancement, NCEY graduates forced to look for jobs under threat of the agency's demise were facing great problems finding opportunities at their salary levels for which their experience at Agency B had qualified them; they were greatly concerned about their future.

Although Agency B pioneered in the use of paraprofessionals, no changes in personnel policies could be discerned which indicated a shift in roles for paraprofessionals and professionals or an expansion of the role for paraprofessionals in agency management and policy making. With length of service came greater autonomy in job functions according to standard practices but no greater opportunities to innovate or modify those practices. A number of NCEY graduates were critical of the fact that they were forbidden to make program adaptations (e.g., introduce ethnic history into remedial education curricula) or to establish interpersonal relationships in intake which would enable the paraprofessionals to function as the intra-agency advocate of the client.

On the other hand, the paraprofessional remained an integral part of the agency's job structure from its very first days until now. Experience with them through the years, however, did not seem to diminish nor expand the role mapped out for them. Clear differ-entiation between professionals and paraprofessionals was maintained, and the feeling among professionals appeared to prevail that the paraprofessional role in Agency B--with opportunities to perform a variety of tasks designated as professional in other institutional settings-signified a significant and democratic approach toward people of limited education.

The view of Agency B in its closing stages today reveals a recognition that these opportunities could have been of more permanent value had true career ladders been provided for paraprofessionals, particularly for those that must now seek jobs elsewhere. The shortcomin has been recognized, however, at a time when the agency is phasing out operations and is not in a position to modify its own practices sufficiently to benefit the NCEY graduates.

AGENCY C

Agency C is a large community action agency operating a variety of programs in a major ghetto area. Established in 1965, it currently receives delegated OEO funds from New York City as a community corporation.

As a program under the Economic Opportunity Act, one of Agency C's initial mandates had been to provide "maximum feasible participation" of the poor in all phases of its operation, as well as to increase their training and job opportunities. As one of its ways of complying, Agency C established a massive on-the-job training program, hired paraprofessionals at the entry level and designated them as trainees. These paraprofessionals were paid stipends instead of salaries and were not eligible for the benefits available to regular employees such as vacations and paid sick leave. At the time of our study, however, this policy had been abandoned; the trainee designation had been dropped and all staff--paraprofessional and professional-- received the same benefits.

An elaborate job classification structure is now operative. It contains 144 classified positions arranged according to twenty grades with minimum salaries starting at $ 3,640 and the maximum at $ 25,380 for the executive director. Of the twenty grades, the first eight may be characterized as paraprofessional classifications. Of the 144 job classifications, 59 (41%) fall within the paraprofessional range .

The jobs above grade 8 are considered by the agency to be professional, and professional almost exclusively is defined as requiring a minimum of a bachelor's degree. At the present time the agency's personnel procedures and practices manual classifies the jobs according to grades; it does not provide classifications according to career lines. Furthermore, the job descriptions for each of the 144 jobs do not identify lower classification jobs as possible prerequisites for higher level jobs.

The agency centrally does not provide career counseling to its employees. Essentially, horizontal movement within the agency is dependent upon the initiative of the employees to secure information for themselves about available openings in other sections of the agency. Vertical movement is mainly dependent upon the opportunities provided by the department or program in which the parparofessional is employed. However, such movement is generally limited to the first eight grades, and the maximum salary to be achieved is $ 8,176 for paraprofessionals.

The agency reports that it is in the process of shifting its emphasis from traditional social work service concepts to those of economic development. It seeks to become the nerve center through which private and public funds can be channeled to generate economic growth in the community, to train residents for high paying jobs and to promote new business and industry in the community which could provide employment. The population served by Agency C is greater than that of many major cities in the country. Its role in relation to the community is somewhat close to quasigovernmental in terms of its expressed purpose in promoting economic growth for the community and economic well being for its residents.

Although four NCEY graduates were employed by Agency C, one is working in a program which functions as almost a separate agency under the multi-program umbrella, and will be reported on as part of Agency D to enable comparison with another NCEY graduate in the same program.

None of the three other NCEY graduates were found to be actually at work at Agency C at the time of the study. C-1 was still employed by the agency, but on sick-leave; C-2, after a short period of employment as a community organizer, left the agency to work for another community action program; C-3, after a short term of employment in the agency's day-care program, left the agency and is now unemployed and on welfare once again.

In terms of income, C-3 ranked lowest among NCEY graduates. She was employed at $ 3,952 and was still at the same level when she resigned six months later. C-2 is earning $ 7,000 at her present job. C-1, who has held a number of different jobs within Agency C, was earning $ 8,000 on his most recent assignment.

A man of 46, C-1 is the oldest NCEY graduate employed at Agency C, and the least educated, having completed only ten years of schooling. C-2, a woman of thirty-five, had completed 15 years of school when she enrolled in the NCEY training program. She plans to resume her education in the fall and complete her degree at a special college operated by her religious denomination. C-3, a woman of 42, is a high school graduate. She has no plans at the present time to pursue her career or secure additional education.

Although occupied with family responsibilities, C-2 reported a high level of activity in the community with welfare rights groups, parents groups and consumer groups. During her period of employment at Agency C, she was highly critical of its practices and sought, found or created opportunities to induce internal change. A zealous reformer, C-2 felt responsible, according to her own reports (confirmed by the agency), for seeking out wrongdoing in Agency C and seeing to it that the public was made aware so that action was taken. As a consequence her term of employment at Agency C (and now in her present job) was stormy. Agency C regards her as able, intelligent and skilled, but was clearly dissatisfied with serving as the target for her reformer's zeal. Staff was unable to find a role within the agency which would focus her energy on targets outside.

Thus it is only with C-1--the one NCEY graduate still employed at Agency C-- that it was possible to measure the agency as an opportunity for career advancement. Yet even in this instance, the match of agency and NCEY graduate was not such as to effectively illustrate the opportunities available for paraprofessionals within the agency. Over the course of three different job assignments in the agency, C-1 was reported as being unable to take supervision or to follow instructions. The agency viewed him as a man of potential and ability who was obstructed by his own negative attitudes from advancing and taking advantage of the opportunities provided by the agency. When Agency C terminated his employment last year, he appealed his case to the board and secured a reversal. The agency was instructed to reinstate him. This decision took place shortly before the NCEY study. When C-1 was interviewed, he was in ill-health suffering from an allergic skin condition, unable to work, and on sick-leave prior to reinstatement. He is expected by the agency to resume employment when he recovers. He reported to NCEY's interviewer that this was his intention as well.

The agency's own assessment of its experience with paraprofessionals after several years is that there is a need to institute aptitude testing, career counseling and supplementary education on a systematic basis, directed at qualifying them for higher level jobs. This is the intention, although it was noted that there are now no funds nor are any expected for this purpose. So, despite the existence of many job titles, there continues to be an emphasis on college degrees as eligibility for higher level jobs. The impact of the experience then, after four years of using paraprofessionals is to seek to enable people to meet the old requirements rather than to establish different standards of eligibility.

In any event the future for paraprofessional opportunities within Agency C looks very poor. As noted earlier, more and more the agency has begun to shift its emphasis away from traditional social services and toward economic development programs. This reflects not only changes in priorities on the basis of service needs, but also a realistic assessment of what new federal funds are likely to be available for. In addition, the agency's role in the community has been challenged by the arrival of other agencies, such as a private non-profit development corporation and a model cities agency. Its early position as the major recipient of federal funds in the community has been superceded and it now feels a need to compete agressively for available funds, diversifying its program if need be to qualify.

Instead of expanding paraprofessional opportunities, Agency C is becoming increasingly a conduit through which residents can receive aptitude tests and counseling and be directed into public and private training and manpower programs. Thus local residents seeking paraprofessional career opportunities are now more likely to be employed through the agency than within it.

AGENCY D

Agency D is a designation used for a national child development program operating with federal funds as a self-contained unit or "sub-agency" under diverse sponsorship throughout New York City. The program provides a wide range of activities and services to preschool children and to their parents and families.

Funded, like Agency C, under a legislative act calling for "maximum feasible participation" of the poor, the program was structured from the very beginning to provide opportunities for paraprofessionals. Indeed the ratio of paraprofessional to professional staff was to favor the former.

However for the first several years after its inception, the tendency of the professional staff in such programs had been to assign paraprofessionals to menial and servile tasks, such as clean-up or escort services. This practice led to the expansion of federal guidelines to insure that opportunities for paraprofessionals would be meaningful. The concern continued to grow until, most recently, the establishment of career ladders has become mandatory for all agencies operating the program under local sponsorship. Individual career plans for paraprofessionals are also required and limited amounts of federal funds are provided for job-related higher education for paraprofessionals leading to an associate arts degree.

The objective of the career ladder and career plans is to enable paraprofessionals to move up progressively as they acquire education and experience to the professional level. However in Agency D most of its professional positions--teacher, psychologist, education director, and social worker--require specific or specialized training and bachelor's or graduate level degrees.

The attainment of an associate degree will not, therefore, be enough to qualify the current paraprofessionals for professional jobs and it is not currently clear what kind of job it will qualify them for. The classic career ladder, going from aide to assistant to associate to intern to fully qualified professional, would be best suited to this agency. However its successful implementation requires that additional funds be provided for salary increases as individuals acquire the academic credits for higher level designations and for higher level education opportunities above the associate level for all paraprofessions who qualify and choose to pursue further education. At the present time the federal funding source has not granted monies for these purposes and budgetary limitations are the largest obstacle to expanding opportunities.

Two NCEY graduates have been employed for several years in Agency D's programs, which operates under different sponsors. As was noted earlier, one NCEY graduate worked in a unit under the umbrella of Agency C.

Both NCEY graduates employed in Agency D are women of 43 years of age. D-1 was a high school graduate; D-2 had completed eleven years of school. Neither NCEY graduate was involved in agency-centered activities for children. Both work with parents, involving them with center activities, helping them to develop themselves and to overcome problems in the family, the home and the community. They also assist families in securing services from other agencies.

At the time of the NCEY study, the local sponsors of Agency D were in the process of trying to comply with the new federal mandate to establish career plans for each individual employee and to establish career ladders in their agencies which would enable paraprofessionals to move continuously upward. However, the findings indicated that neither of the local sponsors had succeded in establishing either career plans for the NCEY graduates or career ladders for their agencies.

One sponsor had nominally promoted D-1 to a position of assistant director. However, the agency lacked the funds for a full-time position at this level. As a result, they promoted her in title and in hourly salary, but reduced the number of hours she works each week to twenty. Thus, she has realized a nominal increase over her starting wage level and a more substantial increase in title. The agency rates her performance highly and she is enthusiastic about her role in the program. Her actual salary for half time is \$ 4,470; on a full-time basis this would annualize at \$ 8,940, placing her in the upper level of salary and position achieved by NCEY graduates. According to D-1, she has advanced her career significantly since completing training at NCEY. She expects to enroll in the near future in a higher education program, sponsored by the federal funding source at a local university, leading to an associate degree. However, the employer agency has not yet established a higher-level job or salary for a holder of this degree.

D-2, also reported a great deal of satisfaction with her job and her employer rates her as a highly valued employee. On the basis of demonstrated ability to do the job, D-2 should be eligible for promotion, according to her supervisor. However, the sponsoring agency currently requires a baccalaureate degree for holders of the next level job, that of social worker. D-2's sponsoring unit is trying to establish a career ladder with alternative requirements but under current budgetary limitations has not yet succeded. The agency is also attempting to redefine job requirements to provide higher-level jobs for holders of the associate arts degree. Since D-2, because of family responsibilities, is not scheduled to enroll in the higher education program, her supervisor believes she may remain ineligible for promotion under the new or restructured career ladder, despite the fact that her present performance warrants immediate promotion.

Thus although Agency D varies from other agencies employing NCEY graduates in that its promotion policies are influenced by the federal mandate requiring that paraprofessionals have continuing opportunities for advancement, its practices up to the time of the study were not found to vary from those of the other agencies. Agency D's sponsors still have structural prohibitions which continue to foreclose opportunities for advancement.

Interviews were also held with the federal funding source and with staff at the university providing the education opportunities. The university staff reported that the education program was being undermined by the inability of the agency's sponsors to reward educational achievements with wage increases or promotions. They indicated that the responsibilities of a full-time job, college work and family needs impose heavy burdens on paraprofessionals. To maintain morale and sustain motivation, enrollees must have assurance that concrete rewards await holders of the A.A. degree. The federal funding source concurred with this view. In response to the sponsor's requests for assistance in designing career plans and establishing career ladders, special consultants providing technical assistance will be made available to local agencies. Also a federal guideline is being established so that national standards for nominal wage increments will be provided to college enrollees as they complete units of study.

In summary, Agency D, though not different in practice from most of the other agencies at the time of the study in terms of the limits set to opportunities for paraprofessional advancement, was found to demonstrate the strongest commitment to change. Though unmet, the mandate for change is clear. The federal funding source requires it, will provide technical assistance to bring it about and will provide supplementary education to enable employees to move up the career ladder. A key need now is for the funds for the individual agencies to really do the job.

AGENCY E

Agency E operates a community mental health program as a storefront service of a voluntary hospital located in a major ghetto. It is affiliated with a university and a medical school. The employment of paraprofessionals is an integral part of this service, which was conceived of as a partnership between community residents and the hospital.

The program aims to deal with the causes of anxiety and mental problems. It is not concerned with helping people to adjust to problems but rather with providing advocacy and assistance to individuals in overcoming and eliminating problems to the extent that it is possible. The range of the problems with which the agency deals includes housing, education, welfare and employment. Helping individuals to act upon oppressive problems and begin to solve them is viewed as a necessary adjunct to the treatment of mental health problems.

The services provided through storefront community mental health centers are staffedbyteams of professionals and paraprofessionals. Intake is done on a rotating basis with paraprofessionals playing key roles in the intake procedure. Paraprofessionals also function as advocates of clients in dealing with a wide range of other agencies and services, and are required to be resourceful in helping clients to locate sources of assistance and secure needed help. They function as agents or representatives of the clients in relation to services within the agency itself as well as outside.

The agency's professional staff consists of psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and medical doctors who provide specialized services to clients. Although there is no continuity between the paraprofessional career line and that of the professionals, there are three paraprofessional job levels:

1. Community Mental Health Worker
2. Senior Community Mental Health Worker
3. Supervising Community Mental Health Worker

Within each grade there are annual increments and individuals are eligible for promotion to the next level when they reach the end of a salary scale in the lower level.

Two NCEY graduates are employed in Agency E. They have been there for three-and-a-half and four years respectively. Both are mature woman, 37 and 42 years of age. E-1 is a high school graduate while E-2 has only completed ten years of schooling. Both are enrolled in the supplementary education program and are working towards an associate arts degree. E-2 will acquire her high school equivalency certificate in the course of college study and will retroactively receive credits for work completed prior to receipt of the certificate. The college works closely with the agency in the development of courses relating to mental health and there will be heavy emphasis on psychology and studies of behavior included in the curriculum. Although the agency itself is affiliated with a university which includes a liberal arts college, it does not provide a course of study leading to an associate arts degree, and the agency has to contract from educational services with an institution that does.

For most of the period since completing training at NCEY, both graduates employed at Agency E worked at storefront community mental health centers. Both graduates were highly enthusiastic about their work, the importance of the service they were providing and the value to the community of the agency. In the fall of 1968, however, one NCEY graduate was appointed as an assistant trainer in the training program the agency operates for paraprofessionals, work which she found far less satisfying. Interviews revealed that her job functions were not as clearly defined and it appeared that she lacked opportunities to display initiative or to work independently as she had in the storefront centers.

The salary scale at this agency, with its three levels of opportunity and wide ranges of increments, places the NCEY graduates there in the high middle income range. They earn $ 7,404 and $ 7,040 respectively. Their entry level salaries were $ 4,212 and $ 3,700. These paraprofessionals were unemployed prior to enrolling in the NCEY training program.

After the interviews were conducted at Agency E, a strike was called for all employees. The original impetus for the strike was the alleged arbitrary dismissal of several paraprofessionals. It soon developed that the dominant issues were larger roles for the community in policy making and administration of the program, and also expansion of opportunities for paraprofessionals, who perceived of themselves as representatives of the community within the agency. The strike, which lasted for many weeks, polarized the staff with some professionals joining forces with paraprofessionals against the administration. Charges of colonial exploitation were leveled against the hospital and the sponsoring university and medical school. Charges of exploitation were also leveled at non-resident professionals for using the job opportunity as a stepping stone for better jobs elsewhere, and for not being committed to serving the community on a long-range basis or in careers dedicated to the development of services in the community.

In the course of the strike and in its subsequent aftermath, it became difficult to reconcile conflicting reports and arrive at simple explanations, verifiable by opposing parties in the dispute. What did become clear was that the management of the program changed, on an interim basis. The administrator was replaced by a triumvirate which included a representative of the paraprofessionals. The future management of the program and the future of its affiliations with the hospital and university complex were not determined at the time the study was completed. Whether the program will continue under a new new affiliation, under the old affiliation with changes, or whether it will be phased out are three possible outcomes.

The NCEY graduates in Agency E did not play a dominate role in the conflict, although they supported the strike in its early stages. At the time of the study their primary concern was whether the agency would continue and thereby whether opportunities for them to advance would continue.

In Agency E, the community role was emphasized from the onset and paraprofessionals, as agents of the community, worked as partners or team members of professionals. It was found that professionals worked as generalists along with the paraprofessionals on the teams, as well as specialists in the fields in which they were trained. Equal partnerships part of the time coupled with unequal opportunities for paraprofessionals to participate in the establishment of policy (or in partnership with administration) had a cumulative negative impact.

The community in which the agency is based could be described as either highly dynamic or volatile. Within its community action and model cities programs demands have been made with great militancy for the right to govern their own affairs and to administer all services to the community. This thrust has been reflected in the upheaval at Agency E.

Because the professionals in Agency E can be truly categorized as professionals (social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, etc.), the agency can only expand paraprofessional opportunities by removing professionals from the performance of generalist functions, or by providing paraprofessionals with the necessary higher education opportunities (including advanced degrees) which would enable them to meet professional standards. Otherwise expanded opportunities for paraprofessionals would have to be in the area of administration and management. These are complicated issues, aired openly, but not yet dealt with.

The agency's experience has also brought to light the issue of community input on policymaking and has raised the question of whether such input should come principally from community residents not employed as paraprofessionals. The issue of who speaks for the community is integrally related to the drive to increase opportunities for paraprofessionals.

AGENCY F

Agency F is a large hospital in a major ghetto. Formerly a municipal hospital, it recently became a voluntary hospital under the sponsorship of a major university. In recent years the agency has been confronted with a multitude of problems which are not central to this study. However some of the consequences of its efforts to deal with these problems have had a direct impact upon NCEY graduates and other paraprofessionals employed there. Of particular significance, as will be shown, has been the affiliation with the university.

Local drives for community participation, decentralization and greater responsiveness to community needs, as well as the thrust for increased employment opportunities for community residents in local services, have also had an impact upon Agency F and the NCEY paraprofessionals it employs.

In the past few years the agency's social services staff has been expanded from 33 to 100 employees. At present three NCEY graduates are employed by Agency F, all within this social services department.

F-1 and F-3 are woman, respectively 47 and 55 years of age. They are both high school graduates. F-2, at 27, is one of the youngest NCEY graduates included in the sample. His education stopped at the 9th grade.

All three NCEY graduates currently earn $ 6,300 per year. All three have worked continuously for Agency F since completing their NCEY training two-and-one-half years ago.

In Agency F's social services department, the NCEY graduates work as part of social service teams, headed by graduate social workers who hold MSW degrees, and also including social work associates who have baccalaureate degrees, and social work assistants who are paraprofessionals.

When the NCEY graduates were first employed at Agency F, it was not yet affiliated with the university and its school of social work. Since this affiliation was made, the staffing pattern has been modified and the social work associates-young college graduates -- were added. As a consequence many tasks initially performed by paraprofessionals-- such as screening and interviewing incoming and outgoing patients-- were assigned to this new category of staff. While the objective was to upgrade the level of service in the agency, the consequence for paraprofessionals was to be made ineligible for work they had performed previously, presumably on a satisfactory basis, because they lacked a baccalaureate degree. This change naturally had an adverse effect upon morale.

Then a shortage of professional staff, combined with the fact that paraprofessionals actually worked better with the patients, induced the agency to give these functions back to the paraprofessionals. And paraprofessionals began to demonstrate: Either they were performing professional functions or the professionals had been performing paraprofessional functions. They were willing to perform the tasks, again, but they wanted more money and more status. This issue is still unsettled.

Further conflicts resulted from the great disparity in salaries paid to the social work associates and those paid the assistants. In addition opportunities for higher education were offered to the associates, who already had college degrees, to work for master's degrees and thus increase their mobility within the agency, while no assistance was provided to paraprofessionals to acquire baccalaureate degrees.

The responses of the NCEY graduates in Agency F to the disparity of opportunities varied considerably. F-3, a woman of 55 has on her own initiative decided to attend college and work for a bachelor's degree. She has been accepted as a part-time student, scheduled to attend classes in September, while still carrying a full work load at Agency F. The agency has agreed to vary her work schedule, allowing her to work evenings and Saturdays so that she can attend classes in the late afternoon. She is a woman of tremendous energy and drive who decided that if the system requires credentials for professional advancement, she will "go the whole route," and get them.

F-2, a young man with only nine years of formal education, has no current plans to return to school. However, he has become active in the agency's union and is an elected delegate for social service employees, professional as well as paraprofessional. In this capacity, he plans to work to improve opportunities and conditions for paraprofessionals.

F-1 is more accepting of the status quo. She is highly regarded by patients and staff (as are the other NCEY graduates). A community resident, living across the street from the hospital, she enjoys her job and the satisfaction provided by the work. She is not as future-oriented as F-3 and is sufficiently satisfied with a meaningful job opportunity not to set herself the difficult goal of becoming a full-fledged professional.

Agency F was found to be lively and growing. It is aggressively seeking to upgrade its standing as an institution responsive to the needs of the community. In the area of social services, the agency was found to be in the process of re-examining its capacity to deliver services, to more effectively utilize personnel, and to expand opportunities for advancement. During the time of the study, the agency shut down temporarily to protest against funding cuts. Changes which could benefit paraprofessionals are not yet visible. The agency reported that the establishment of a permanent classification for paraprofessionals was on the agenda for the future.

Thus, the findings indicate that limited opportunities exist for paraprofessionals at Agency F at the present time. They are permanent employees, they are represented in the union, they come from a community which is expected to have a greater voice in the agency. Experience has demonstrated their value and importance, but as of the moment the agency has not expanded their role and status and opportunities as a result.

AGENCY G

Agency G is a large municipal agency in the field of public service employment. It is responsible for recruitment, selection, testing, classification and placement of government employees. In these areas of major responsibilities, no paraprofessionals are employed.

Paraprofessionals were initially hired by the agency in 1965, when the agency was given responsibility for the placement and supervision of youth assigned to public agencies under a federally funded youth employment program. To meet these responsibilities, paraprofessionals were hired to work within the agency. Their salaries were paid with federal funds delegated by another public agency which has overall responsibility for the program .

It is of historic interest that the decision to employ paraprofessionals in Agency G can be traced to NCEY's training program. An agency executive reports that at the time they were considering hiring paraprofessionals, they learned of the NCEY training program, which could provide trained paraprofessional job candidates. Using the NCEY training program as a criterion for eligibility, the agency established a new non-competitive civil service series. Paraprofessional employees were provisional, since funding was on a year-to-year basis and the future of the program and thereby the jobs for paraprofessionals within the agency were not assured.

Four NCEY graduates were hired by Agency G. Three of them are still there and have been there for close to four years. In the course of their employment within the agency, a new public agency was created in New York City which employs large numbers of paraprofessionals. For this new agency, a new civil service series was designed that would meet the needs of its staff. This series is still provisional, awaiting the development of appropriate civil service examinations.

When the new series was established provisionally, Agency G arranged to have its paraprofessional employees graded at the series' entry level. However, the budget did not provide for more than one job level for Agency G's paraprofessional employees. Thus, though nominally part of a larger civil service series, NCEY graduates in Agency G still have single level opportunities available to them.

The agency reports that it is seeking to have these jobs upgraded. On the basis of performance, experience and scope of responsibilities, the positions held by NCEY graduates should be reclassified at a higher level. But at the time of the study, this upgrading had not occurred. Only by leaving the agency, and transferring to a public agency utilizing the full paraprofessional civil service series, could an NCEY graduate advance. After the interviews were completed, one NCEY graduate did transfer from Agency G to the agency with overall responsibility for the youth employment program (which it delegated in part to Agency G). Thus, she is working in substantially the same job, though in a different agency, at a higher rating and a higher salary.

Of the four NCEY graduates employed by Agency G, three are women. G-1 and G-4 are respectively 27 and 29, G-2 is 38, and G-3 is a man of 49. Three of the group are high school graduates, while G-1 completed only 10 years of high school.

G-1 and G-3 have the same job assignment, sharing responsibility for supervising or following up on all in-and-out-of-school enrollees in the youth employment program. The work load is large, but the agency indicated that they were thoroughly familiar with their work and able to perform satisfactorily.

G-2, after initially working with her fellow NCEY graduates, became the assistant to a man responsible for providing information to communities on employment opportunities in the public sector, whether municipal, state or federal, and for providing training to trainers in locally based civil service test pereparation programs. She also participates in job fairs and other related activities which bring information to job seekers about employment opportunities in the public sector.

The fourth NCEY graduate, G-4, was terminated by the agency under unpleasant circumstances. In accord with her dismissal, she felt that she had undermined the position of other paraprofessionals and that as a result their behavior would be more closely monitored.

Agency G provided continuing work opportunities to the NCEY graduates. Their earnings however at the time of the study were only slightly more than $ 5,000, which places them in the lowest range of NCEY graduates. This is about a $ 300 raise in more than four years of employment. In addition, the fact that they are still in a provisional status in an agency governed by civil service means that they are in an unprotected position. Their employment can be terminated, they are not eligible for many benefits, they are not eligible for union membership, and they do not receive credit for their period of employment. The fact that the civil service test which could secure them permanent positions is not yet available, intensified the uncertainty and the anxiety of their role. They have no assurance that they will be able to pass the test, since they do not know what it will contain.

In Agency G the strict distinction between professionals and paraprofessionals has been maintained in numerous ways in addition to the overriding fact that the paraprofessional function is a single-level appendage to the agency's continuous job structure. The position itself was not created to fulfill an aspect of the agency's basic function. Instead it was created to fulfill auxillary responsibilities assigned to it by a federally funded program operating mainly out of other agencies. These responsibilities might at any time be removed from the agency. If this occurs, all but one paraprofessional would be withdrawn from Agency G.

Thus far, therefore, the paraprofessional has achieved only a temporary and marginal place in Agency G. Their high performance level raises questions about the need for more opportunities for paraprofessionals as the agency seeks to deliver increased and better services. But these questions would bring into consideration the larger issue of job restructuring and redesign within this long-established agency and it is unlikely that such an issue will be brought to the table for discussion during this time of retrenchment and cost-cutting in municipal agencies and in the federal government as well.

Agency executives report they are trying to offset the negative factors just described. However, they say this is possible to only a limited extent. Both NCEY graduates and agency staff expressed the hope that their positions will be reclassified soon at a higher level, that the salary will be increased and that the civil service examination barrier can be crossed successfully and quickly. These obstacles make it impossible to address the issue of increasing opportunities for continued mobility. The emphasis, at the moment, is simply on creating permanent employment.

AGENCY H

Long established in the field of employment services, this public agency expanded its activities in the early 60's to provide outreach services to low-income, minority-group members in local communities. To implement this decision, a new category of staff was created, the community worker, a paraprofessional. A non-competitive civil service classification was established with annual increments.

Until this position was established, the agency had two civil service series: one for clerical staff, and one for professional staff.

The new classification was not continuous with either series. It was established above the clerical level, at grade 10, but the first professional classification was rated at grade 14.

No linkage was established between the paraprofessional and professional series. Neither was experience acquired at the paraprofessional level credited towards eligibility for higher level positions. The agency had established the baccalaureate degree as the eligibility requirement for the entry level professional job, with alternatives such as experience in employment service which paraprofessionals could not acquire. This was desite the fact that much of the work actually performed by paraprofessionals within the agency, according to supervisors, provided experience equal to and as relevant as employment agency experience.

Four NCEY graduates have been employed by Agency H, although only three were available for interviews.* All were assigned to job functions which brought them into direct relationships with low income minority group job seekers.

Three NCEY graduates worked in a decentralized service operated by Agency H which concentrates on expanding the opportunities available to youth through active recruitment, counseling, working with families, meeting health needs, securing basic education services, placement in job training programs and actual job placement. This agency, more than any other included in the study, has to establish and maintain wide ranges of relationships with other agencies in order to provide the services needed by its clients. The approach is active advocacy of the clients' interest. Paraprofessionals are used as outreach workers to recruit and follow up clients. Loss of interest on the part of clients is not ignored. The agency through its paraprofessionals seeks to stimulate lagging interest and to identify the obstacles impeding participation, such as family problems, trouble with school, employers, law enforcement agencies, health or addiction.

---

* The fourth, no longer working at Agency H, is not included in the study sample.

Of the three NCEY graduates currently employed in this service, two have been working continuously in the same location for over three years. These two NCEY graduates, currently employed in Agency H's youth service program, are a woman of 38 and a young man of 27.

H-1, the woman, had already completed two years of college when she enrolled in the NCEY program. Family responsibilities for the next few years prevent her from continuing her education. Although the agency does not provide released time, she is eligible for some tuition reimbursement, ranging from 50% for courses not related to her work to 100% for courses directly related. Her supervisor rates her as an extraordinarily able employee with a capacity to advance without limit if she acquired the higher education degree, which serves as the entry within the agency for advancement to higher levels. Her supervisor indicated her belief that H-1's experience as a community worker for three years combined with the two years of college she had completed would make her able to perform the entry level professional job at the present time, but this is not possible.

H-3, the other NCEY graduate employed in the agency's youth program had not gone beyond the 8th grade. Personal problems in his early teens took him carry out this recommendation will require considerable federal government funding and leadership together with full cooperation from local government, employing agencies, and educational institutions.

There is some sentiment for establishing the A.A. degree (two years of college) as a paraprofessional credential. Obviously this is easier to achieve than a four-year baccalaureate. But it must be pointed out that unless its achievement is rewarded with a higher level job and a salary increase it will accomplish only disappointment and frustration for the paraprofessional.

3. Skill training for paraprofessionals, both classroom and on-the-job, should be expanded and geared to the generalist tasks, pointed up in Chapter V of this study, such as recruiting, making home visits, interviewing, providing information and materials and follow-up. Needing to be expanded is core training in basic generalist functions that will be common to all human service agencies, or at least to each field of service, with the knowledge and skill imparted becoming interchangeable among a wide range of agencies. This is the route to making education more meaningful and relevant. It is further recommended that a system of work rotation, possibly combined with study, be developed among a number of human service agencies to enable paraprofessionals performing similar functions to work in more than one agency, and thus diversify and strengthen their experience. The goal of all training should not only be to improve paraprofessional competence in current jobs but also to equip them to perform at the next

higher level. With increments of training must come recognition in the form of increments of responsibility and salary.

FOR THE AGENCIES

To achieve greater mobility among paraprofessionals, changes in agency employment policies, practices and structures are needed. Specifically:

4. Human service agencies employing paraprofessionals must be required to establish continuous career ladders from the entry level through higher level jobs requiring professional competence. In order to establish career ladders, agencies need to conduct functional task analyses for all levels of jobs, including those of professionals, in order to define and restructure jobs, identify knowledge and skill needed to perform them, and spell out specific qualifications for employment and promotion. Jobs from the entry level on up need to be redesigned in a continuous and inter-related series. Such restructuring is a minimum condition for achieving paraprofessional career mobility.

5. The use of the academic credential (the baccalaureate or higher degree) as virtually the sole requirement for professional employment urgently needs to be reconsidered. As this study has clearly demonstrated, the lack of the degree has been the major bar to paraprofessional advancement. Employing agencies, unions, professional and licensing groups, civil service bodies and indeed even service recipients and the paraprofessionals themselves have a common responsibility to determine how many years and what kind

of schooling are really needed for employment and promotion and to identify and weight equivalent experience as an alternative qualification to formal education. They also have a common responsibility, together with educational institutions, to re-examine the relevance and quality of college courses and to seek greater meaningfulness by reduction, streamlining, or enrichment of courses. We call upon all interested groups to form a joint study commission to re-evaluate requirements for employment and advancement in the human services.

6. Staff development programs should be created for supervisors and professionals working with paraprofessionals. Colleges and professional schools do not yet provide courses in supervision of paraprofessionals or in the relations of professionals to paraprofessionals. Such programs will enable supervisors to function as team leaders and staff developers in the integration of heterogeneous staff delivering highly complex services. They will enable supervisors to provide the personal development, motivation and confidence, and knowledge and skills paraprofessionals need. Moreover, training of professionals will enable them to relate better to paraprofessionals and to utilize them more effectively.

7. Federal agencies providing funds to programs employing paraprofessionals need to gear their fiscal guidelines and budgetary policies to promoting career mobility opportunities. Fiscal incentives can be provided in the form of supplemental funds to cover salary increments for paraprofessionals as they

progress along career ladders, for training and tuition costs for personnel, and for technical assistance to design and implement career ladders, to review and revise job structures, requirements and testing procedures.

8. Fundamental changes must be made in civil service policies, practices and procedures. Irrelevant requirements in formal education, work experience or personal characteristics should be eliminated. Oral exams or performance tests should be substituted for written examinations. Consideration should be given to providing basic training to paraprofessionals in order to qualify for the first level jobs and to base subsequent promotions on skill and knowledge acquired through work experience and on-the-job training. Recommended is a policy of hiring first and training later. Above all, however, civil service job classifications need to be re-examined to remove rigid inflexibilities, to meet the special needs of employees from minority groups, and to incorporate paraprofessional tasks and structures. To assure equality of opportunity in promotion, new categories and qualifications must be developed while establishing a continuous series of classifications moving in a connected way from entry level paraprofessional to that of the professional.

9. A central consulting service for agencies employing paraprofessionals should be established. Perhaps tied to the central counseling service for paraprofessionals (Recommendation #1), it would provide technical assistance to agencies seeking to deal

with the problems of paraprofessional career mobility. Part of the reason that agencies have not established better promotion policies and practices is because they have not known what to do. A consulting service that pooled the available information and wisdom could provide the needed know-how on designing career ladders and job structures and defining appropriate qualifications for hiring paraprofessionals and improved methods for training them.

10. A new generation of demonstration projects addressed to ways of upgrading paraprofessionals is urgently needed. The values of employing them have been amply demonstrated. What is timely now is to experiment with various approaches--field by field--for achieving career advancement. Tested out should be a variety of experiences after paraprofessionals have been hired, including experiments in changes in agency structures and policies, job design and assignments, and in-service training. One focus should be on job linkages and how to advance in them. Another focus should be on intensive intervention at the level of counseling and job development. The demonstrations need to be clear on who will change what and how to pay for it. Expecially useful would be a feedback of the results of these demonstrations to the consulting service advocated in Recommendation #8.

FOR THE FIELDS OF SERVICE

Basic to the consideration of qualifications for promotion and the restructuring of jobs into a career ladder is the need for substantive criteria for the evaluation of performance. It is impossible to determine precisely who, with what skill and knowledge, can handle which responsibilities, at what time and in what progression, without being able to evaluate the performance. Evaluation, in turn, needs to be based on what each service aims to accomplish in the light of the needs of people.

11. For each major field of human service (health or education, for example), a major project should be undertaken to establish evaluative criteria for all personnel and the tasks they perform. This should lead to a re-examination of service goals, alternative service delivery systems, tasks to be performed by professionals and paraprofessionals, and the actual skill and knowledge required to perform them. Only through such a basic re-examination is it possible to achieve the reforms and changes that will genuinely structure a work force and a career ladder that uses both professionals and paraprofessionals to the best possible advantage of themselves, their agencies and the public they serve.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT THE NCEY TRAINING PROGRAM

The establishment of youth employment programs by the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development uncovered great potentials for new occupations in youth-serving agencies. With the advent of the Economic Opportunity Act, the Vocational Education Act, and other legislation, the potential multiplied. New concepts were fostered that called for changes in existing patterns of work in the human relations field. Among the more important concepts was the recognition that people without formal professional training could contribute significantly to the operation of youth-serving agencies.

The National Committee on Employment of Youth was in the forefront of this movement, as it believed that the use of nonprofessionals could bring about better services, both qualitatively and quantitatively, to youth in need of help. However, NCEY also foresaw possible dangers if such personnel were "turned loose" without any training.

Therefore, NCEY developed a "demonstration on-the-job training program for semi-professional personnel in youth employment programs," which was funded from November 24,1964 through February 3, 1967, under a contract with the U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Manpower, Automation and Training and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training.

The purpose of the program was to "demonstrate the value of employing 'indigenous' adults as semi-professional workers in youth employment programs or agencies."

A total of 124 adults, male and female, age 22 or older, who were residents of disadvantaged neighborhoods or members of minority groups in New York City, were selected for participation in one of six twelve-week training cycles. 118 graduated. Each cycle had an enrollment of approximately 20 adults for a 12-week training program that consisted of a combination of on-the-job training, field trips, classroom discussion and evaluation.

The objective was to train a number of nonprofessionals in an experimental setting and to develop techniques for their selection, training and placement which might be utilized by other programs and agencies as well. It was believed that the successful use of such trained personnel could have beneficial effects on the field of youth employment. First, it could help relieve the growing shortage of professional workers by allowing existing professional workers to use their unique skills more fully. Second, it could create new levels of jobs for many different kinds of people who could contribute value to the field, and third, it could result in increased services to youth in need of help.

The program was based on a number of hypotheses:

1) That people indigenous to a disadvantaged neighborhood or group could establish rapport with youth from similar circumstances more easily than could professionals with a middle-class orientation.

2) That they could be trusted by the youth to a greater extent than the professionals might be.

3) That such people would have first-hand knowledge of the problems and needs of unemployed youth.

4) That they would have had practical experience in dealing with the agencies and power structures in their communities.

5) That they could handle, in a more subjective way, those problems which have not been amenable to solution by the professional workers objectivity.

To augment these inherent attributes, NCEY provided the trainees with:

1) Background material on the causesof youth employment problems and other problems of poverty.

2) Methods for dealing with the population being served in different situations, such as techniques for interviewing, remediation, observation, counseling, leadership development and problem solving.

3) Information about community resources which could be passed on to youth and their families and utilized in meeting daily crises.

4) Orientation to and analysis of structures and goals and roles of the professional workers.

5) Practical application through on-the-job training to synthesize the more didactic aspects of the training and illustrate to the students their own roles within any agency structure.

The training program's experimental and demonstration features were:

I- Identifying those tasks within an agency that could be performed by paraprofessional personnel.

a) Evaluating the role of the professional

b) Isolating those tasks done by the professional that are nonprofessional in nature.

c) Developing job descriptions for these tasks.

II- Developing methods to identify those adults who could succeed in this field.

III- Developing a training program that would insure the greatest opportunities for success. This would include:

a) Devising a classroom curriculum that would meet requirements for the job to be performed.

b) Developing training stations that would offer the best type of learning experience.

c) Integrating the classroom and on-the-job training so that optimum learning could take place.

d) Effecting changes and attitudes and degrees of involvement on the part of professionals and institutions.

RESULTS OF THE NCEY TRAINING PROGRAM

NCEY's approach throughout all six training cycles was experimental and developmental. The experience of each training cycle was used in the development of each subsequent cycle. Furthermore, the participating agencies in the on-the-job training aspect of the program contributed to the development of the curriculum so that the trainees could be best prepared to meet the requirements of the job they would be doing. Significantly, the trainees themselves were involved in the development of the program and the curriculum in each cycle, and modifications in content and adjustments in schedules were made to meet the interests and needs of each training group. The results were a high level of participation by trainees. There was a remarkably low dropout rate. Of the 124 enrollees in the six training cycles, 118 completed the training.

RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF ENROLLEES

Referrals to the program were made by the New York State Employment Service, individuals, trainees and graduates. On occasion, on-the-job training supervisors also made referrals. The basic selection criteria were as flexible as possible. Primary emphasis was placed on the desire of the applicant to work with people. Referring sources were instructed to seek individuals with characteristics that indicated desire and ability to work with people. The program was open to individuals of 22 years of age or older, with no upper age limit. It was available to both males and females and there were no minimum educational requirements. Individuals were sought,however, with ability to read, write and speak English well enough to communicate with professional staff and those to whom services were provided.

The composition of the groups was highly varied, (Statistical analysis of the characteristics of each of the training groups are summarized in the table on the following page.)

Midway through the training program, however, analysis revealed that most trainees fell into three ability groupings: 1) those with educational and experience limitations, who profited from the program's structure and who also needed "fluffing out", 2) those seeking direction, who used the program as a "stepping off" period- an opportunity to assess themselves and acquire some degree of self-rehabilitation, and 3) those who mainly needed an opportunity for admission into this new employment area.

CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRST THREE TRAINING GROUPS

Category	1st Grp.	2nd Grp.	3rd Grp.	Total
1. Total enrolled in project	21	20	20	61
a. Sex				
1) Male	11	9	8	28
2) Female	10	11	12	33
b. Age				
1) 22-29	14	10	10	34
2) 30-39	6	7	6	19
3) 40 and over	1	3	4	8
c. Ethnicity				
1) Negro	16	16	17	49
2) White	0	0	1	1
3) Other (Puerto Rican, Cuban, Haitian)	5	4	2	11
d. Education				
1) 9th & 10th	2	3	4	9
2) 11th	1	2	2	5
3) 12th (HSG)	11	8	8	27
4) Over 12th	7	7	6	20
e. Marital Status				
1) Single	10	4	7	21
2) Married	7	9	2	18
3) Separated & Divorced	4	5	10	19
4) Widowed	0	2	1	3
f. Head of Household or family	13	14	18	45
g. Police Record	3	2	4	9
2. Number dropped by program	1	0	1	2
3. Voluntary dropouts	0	0	0	0
4. Number completed training	20	20	19	59

CHARACTERISTICS OF SECOND THREE TRAINING GROUPS

Category	4th Grp.	5th Grp.	6th Grp.	Total
1. Total enrolled in project	21	22	22	65
a. Sex				
1) Male	9	7	10	26
2) Female	12	15	12	39
b. Age				
1) 22-29	9	13	10	32
2) 30-39	9	4	8	21
3) 40 and over	3	5	4	12
c. Ethnicity				
1) Negro	17	15	13	45
2) White	1	2	0	3
3) Other (Puerto Rican, Cuban, Haitian)	3	5	9	17
d. Education				
1) Under 9th	0	3	1	4
2) 9th & 10th	3	0	5	8
3) 11th	1	5	2	8
4) 12th(HSG)	11	8	11	30
5) Over 12th	6	6	3	15
e. Marital Status				
1) Single	3	10	6	19
2) Married	11	5	10	26
3) Separated & Divorced	6	6	6	18
4) Widowed	1	1	0	2
f. Head of Household or family	17	18	19	54
g. Police Record	3	5	3	11
2. Number dropped by program	1	2	2*	5
3. Voluntary dropouts	0	0	1	1
4. Number completed training	20	20	19	59

* Hired in related jobs prior to completion of program

Because of the wide degree of differences between trainees, particularly in the areas of education and prior employment experience, the program was to a large extent individualized, particularly in the curriculum area which emphasized self-development (oral expression, writing skills, reading skills, ability to analyze and interpret data, and personal communications).

The curriculum also attempted to provide experience in three other major areas:

1) Skills in interviewing, counseling, remediation, testing, observing, reporting, planning and organization.

2) Knowledge of the psychology of youth, environmental circumstances and emotional problems, employment and educational opportunities, addiction, probation and parole, problems of minority group members, agency structure and operation, and an overview of industry personnel practices.

3) Knowledge of attitudes, behavior of self and others, processes of human dynamics, interaction and group interaction.

With on-the-job training as the "lab experiences" to complement classroom learning, the trainee was encouraged to develop sensitivity to the complexities of human behavior, a habit for inquiry for information and the self-confidence to exercise judgment in suggesting solutions. Efforts were also made to develop the understanding that there is seldom one right solution to problems, but rather a range of alternatives.

Despite some initial antipathy towards the use of paraprofessionals there was little difficulty in obtaining on-the-job training stations for the trainees, and a wide range of public and private agencies participated (see appendix C for listing of these agencies). The kinds of jobs performed in the different agencies however, did not differ as much as had been expected; there were remarkable similarities among agencies with different goals, clientele and sponsorship.

One major concern was in placing trainees in agencies where there could be a real learning experience. As much as possible, efforts were made to find stations which would provide trainees with direct contact with the youth being served. It was found that agencies more often underutilized the trainees than misused them, and that trainees were sometimes left to shift for themselves without direction or assignment. This usually occurred when work assignments were not carefully delineated or when supervisors themselves were unsure about how to use paraprofessionals. One of the most valuable aspects of the training was the use of agency supervisors in the classroom to describe their goals, the type of youth they worked with and the jobs the NCEY trainees were doing and could do in the future. Moreover,their involvement in the classroom work made the on-the-job relationship between supervisors and trainee much closer.

Comments made by the on-the-job supervisors both in regular written reports and in conversations with NCEY staff indicated that the trainees were performing at an extremely high level of skill, for which the supervisors had not been prepared. Initially, the major contributions of trainees were in the day-to-day performance of routine tasks which relieved the professionals of much burdensome work and enabled them to spread their skills where needed most.

As the ability of the graduates became more evident, they were allowed to perform additional tasks that gradually brought most to higher level functions. Supervisors felt more confident about the trainees' ability to perform a variety of tasks well. This changing concept of the value of nonprofessionals was dramatic. The on-the-job training segment proved its worth as it gave supervisors an opportunity to try out paraprofessionals without having to guarantee full-time jobs or to change agency policies.

The most successful job stations were those in agencies that provided a variety of activities and opportunities for trainees to test themselves in different roles. The least successful were in those agencies with unstructured programs which appeared to the trainees to be poorly planned.

IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF THE NCEY TRAINING PROGRAM

The on-the-job training was for most graduates a successful experience. A number of agencies which had not employed paraprofessionals previously did so subsequently on the basis of successful experiences with NCEY graduates. Thus the immediate positive results of the program were twofold: 1) agencies were provided with successful initial experiences in the utilization of paraprofessionals, and 2) a pool of trained paraprofessionals were provided as their initial employees.

JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

One of the objectives of the training program was to orient the trainees' to a wide range of opportunities for employment in the human services. The program did not include guarantees of job placement.

However, as much assistance as possible was given to the graduates, both through the strenuous job development efforts made by the program staff and through the cooperation of New York State Employment Service. The staff really had to work hard to pursuade agencies to employ the trainees. Part of the problem was the continued resistance of many agencies to hiring nonprofessionals, but the major problem was simply the lack of budget and funding for this unconventional type of employee.

The placement record of the six cycles of trainees was as follows: Of 118 trainees who completed the six cycles, 66 immediately obtained full-time jobs related to their training and another 15 immediately obtained full-time jobs unrelated to their training. Two returned to school full-time. The balance were either working in part-time or temporary jobs unrelated to training or were unemployed at the time the sixth training program was completed and the project terminated.

APPENDIX B

National Committee on Employment of Youth

Trainee Questionnaire

NAME OF INTERVIEWER: ______________________________

DATE OF INTERVIEWER: ______________________________

PLACE OF INTERVIEW: ______________________________

* * * * *

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

Name of Agency: ______________________________

Title of Unit (program): ______________________________

Date Employed: ______________________________

Salary: Starting ____________________ Current ______________

Name of Supervisor: ______________________________

TRAINEE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Below is a list of tasks. First, indicate which are part of your present job; then rate each task according to the amount of time you spend on each, using the following code:

Code: 1-most; 2-a lot; 3-some; 4-very little

		Part of present job:		Time spent:
		Yes	No	
1.	Recruiting			
2.	Making home visits			
3.	Following up in community			
4.	Following up by phone			
5.	Accompanying clients to agencies			
6.	Contacting other agencies			
7.	Contacting employers			
8.	Interviewing			
9.	Providing information			
10.	Providing advice			
11.	Providing materials			
12.	Counseling			
13.	Screening			
14.	Writing reports			
15.	Keeping records			
16.	Correspondence			
17.	Clerical			
18.	Organizing activities			
19.	Organizing meetings			
20.	Supervising			
21.	Training other workers			
22.	Making job assignments			
23.	Administrating			
24.	Testing			
25.	Teaching			

2. For those tasks listed below which you do on your present job, please indicate whether you do them alone, with another paraprofessional, your supervisor, or with someone else.

	Task is done			
	alone	para-prof.	supvr.	other (specify)
1. Recruiting				
2. Making home visits				
3. Following up in community				
4. Following up by phone				
5. Accompanying clients to agencies				
6. Contacting other agencies				
7. Contacting employers				
8. Interviewing				
9. Providing information				
10. Providing advice				
11. Providing materials				
12. Counseling				
13. Screening				
14. Writing reports				
15. Keeping records				
16. Correspondence				
17. Clerical				
18. Organizing activities				
19. Organizing meetings				
20. Supervising				
21. Training other workers				
22. Making job assignments				
23. Administrating				
24. Testing				
25. Teaching				

3. For those tasks listed below which do you do on your present job? First, indicate whether you learned how to do them before or after you came to the agency; and then indicate from whom you learned them, using the code below.

Code: 1=NCEY; 2=Agency; 3+other (specify)

		When learned		From whom		
		before	after	NCEY	Agency	Other
1.	Recruiting					
2.	Making home visits					
3.	Following up in community					
4.	Following up by phone					
5.	Accompanying clients to agencies					
6.	Contacting other agencies					
7.	Contacting employers					
8.	Interviewing					
9.	Providing information					
10.	Providing advice					
11.	Providing materials					
12.	Counseling					
13.	Screening					
14.	Writing reports					
15.	Keeping records					
16.	Correspondence					
17.	Clerical					
18.	Organizing activities					
19.	Organizing meetings					
20.	Supervising					
21.	Training other workers					
22.	Making job assignments					
23.	Administrating					
24.	Testing					
25.	Teaching					

4. How would your performance of each of the tasks below be rated by you? Use the code below for your ratings.

Code: 1-More than adequate; 2-Adequate; 3-Less than adequate

	More than adequate	Adequate	Less than adequate
1. Recruiting			
2. Making home visits			
3. Following up in community			
4. Following up by phone			
5. Accompanying clients to agencies			
6. Contacting other agencies			
7. Contacting employers			
8. Interviewing			
9. Providing information			
10. Providing advice			
11. Providing materials			
12. Counseling			
13. Screening			
14. Writing reports			
15. Keeping records			
16. Correspondence			
17. Clerical			
18. Organizing activities			
19. Organizing meetings			
20. Supervising			
21. Training other workers			
22. Making job assignments			
23. Administrating			
24. Testing			
25. Teaching			

SUPERVISION:

5. How much are you supervised:

Too much _____ Too little _____ Just about right ______

6. Do you meet with your supervisor on a daily basis to review your work?

7. Do you report to your supervisor daily?

8. How frequently do you attend staff meetings?

9. How available is your supervisor when needed by you?

10. Do you work in the same office as your supervisor?

11. How well does your supervisor understand the problems you encounter?

12. Let's review your supervisor's helpfulness.

He is most helpful in:

He is least helpful in:

He could be more helpful in:

13. Let's review your supervisor's demands:

He is most demanding in:

He is least demanding in:

He should be less demanding in:

14. Has your supervisor assisted you in advancing your career?

If so, how?

COMMENTS:

TRAINING

15. Does the agency have an in-service training program?

16. What elses does the in-service training cover?

    Skills:

    Knowledge (subjects):

    Understanding (self and others):

17. Is the training provided only to paraprofessionals?

18. Is training provided to the total staff team in your unit?

19. How valuable is the training to you on the job? How has it helped you?

20. How often is training offered?

21. How long do the sessions last?

22. Has the agency provided you with training outside the agency? If so, describe:

23. Do you feel the agency should provide more training to its staff?

    to paraprofessionals?

    to others (supervisors, professionals, etc.) in

24. Do you feel the training you have received will help you to get and hold a higher level job?

    In this agency? Elsewhere?

ADDITIONAL EDUCATION

25. Years of schooling completed:

26. Do you feel you need more education to advance?

27. Are you enrolled now?

    Has the agency provided the opportunity for you to continue your education? If so, how?

28. Do you have plans to enroll?

29. Does the agency pay tuition?

30. Does the agency provide released time for study with pay?

31. Are funds a problem?

32. Are there any other obstacles in your way?

COMMENTS:

FUTURE JOBS AND CAREER ADVANCEMENT

33. Please list the positions in this agency which you would to advance.

34. For each position, use the task list and note those tasks which would be used on this job you would like to seek.

35. For each position, list any obstacles, availability, skill deficiencies or others which would deter you.

36. In what way does the agency help you to advance your career?

37. What are you doing to advance your career in this agency?

38. What obstacles do you see as deterring you from continuing with this agency?

    In your present job?

    In any subsequent job?

39. Do you know about available opportunities in other agencies for advancement?

COMMENTS:

PERSONAL INFORMATION

40. Marital status:

41. Family Status:

42. Number of dependents:

43. Employment status:

APPENDIX C

AGENCIES EMPLOYING AND/OR TRAINING NCEY GRADUATES

Action for Progress, University Settlement

Adelphi College, School of Social Work

Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation

Bedford-Stuyvesant Young Men's Christian Association

Bedford-Stuyvesant Youth In Action

Board of Education Community Centers

Bronx River Neighborhood Houses

Brooklyn Community College

Brooklyn House of Detention

Brotherhood-In-Action

Brownsville Community Corporation

Camp Kilmer Job Corps Center

CANDO Intercultural Instruction Center

Catholic Charities of New York City

Community Council of Greater New York

Community Service Psychological Institute

Council for a Better East New York

East Harlem Youth Employment Service

East Tremont Community Corporation

Federation Employment and Guidance Service

Federation of Jewish Philanthropies

Forest Neighborhood Houses

Harlem Hospital

HARYOU Youth and Work Program

Head Start

Henry Street Settlement House

Hospital or Joint Diseases

Hudson Guild Settlement House

Hunts Point Community Corporation

Job Orientation in Neighborhoods (JOIN)

Kings County Hospital

Lincoln Hospital

Lower West Side Community Progress Center

Madison Square Boys Club

Maimonides Medical Center

Mary Immaculate Hospital

Mobilization For Youth

National Committee on Employment of Youth

National Opinion Research Center

Newark Housing Authority

New York City Addiction Services Agency

New York City Department of Correction

New York City Department of Personnel

New York City Department of Social Services

New York City Housing and Development Agency

New York City Mission Society

New York Medical College

New York State Employment Service - Youth Opportunity Centers

New York State Narcotics Addition Control Commission

New York State Supreme Court

Police Athletic League

Puerto Rican Family Institute

St. Mary's Hospital

Social Security Administration

Southeast Bronx United

Springfield College Pre-release Guidance Center

Surgical and Social Rehabilitation Project

Training Resources For Youth

United Neighborhood Houses

United Planning Organization, Washington D.C.

United Progress Inc., Trenton, New Jersey

Vocational Advisory Service

Williamsburg Community Corporation

Young Women's Christian Association

Youth Counsel Bureau, Office of the District Attorney